



[CA Home Page](#)  
[Governor's Home Page](#)  
[About the Commission](#)  
[Credential Information](#)

[Examination Information](#)  
[Coded Correspondence](#)  
[Credential Alerts](#)  
[Educational Standards](#)

[Reports-on-Line](#)  
[Committee on Accreditation](#)  
[Troops to Teachers](#)  
[Other Sites of Interest](#)

[Home](#) | [CA Home Page](#) | [Governor's Home Page](#) | [About the Commission](#) | [Credential Information](#) | [Examination Information](#)  
[Coded Correspondence](#) | [Credential Alerts](#) | [Educational Standards](#) | [Reports-on-Line](#) | [Committee on Accreditation](#)  
[Troops to Teachers](#) | [Other Sites of Interest](#)

# Agenda

## California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

November 3-4, 1999 • Commission Offices • 1900 Capitol Avenue • Sacramento, CA 95814

Some of the agenda items are available for viewing on the web.

Click on the  to view the items that are available.

### WEDNESDAY, November 3, 1999 Commission Office

#### 1. Closed Session (Chair Norton) 1:00 p.m.

(The Commission will meet in Closed Session Pursuant to California Government Code Section 11126 as well as California Education Code Sections 44245 and 44248)

#### 2. Legislative Committee of the Whole (Committee Chair Reed)

 **LEG-1** Status of Bills of Interest to the Commission

#### 3. Appeals and Waivers Committee (Committee Chair Harvey)




**A&W-1** Approval of the Minutes  
**A&W-2** Reconsideration of Waiver Denials  
**A&W-3** Waivers: Consent Calendar  
**A&W-4** Waivers: Conditions Calendar  
**A&W-5** Waivers: Denials Calendar

### THURSDAY, November 4, 1999 Commission Office





#### 1.. General Session (Chair Norton) 8:00 a.m.

**GS-1** Roll Call  
**GS-2** Pledge of Allegiance  
**GS-3** Approval of October 1999 Minutes  
**GS-4** Approval of the November Agenda  
**GS-5** Approval of the November Consent Calendar  
**GS-6** Annual Calendar of Events  
**GS-7** Chair's Report  
**GS-8** Executive Director's Report  
**GS-9** Report on Monthly State Board Meeting







#### 2. Performance Standards Committee of the Whole (Committee Chair Katzman)

-  **PERF-1** Report on Extant Teaching Performance Assessments for Beginning Teachers
-  **PERF-2** Preliminary Annual Report on the Multiple Subject Assessment for Teaching (MSAT): October 1992 through June 1999  
(Note: Large file...Please allow sufficient time for downloading)
-  **PERF-3** Report on the Validity of and Recommended Passing Standards on the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA) as a Requirement for the Education Specialist Instruction Credential




### 3. Fiscal Planning & Policy Committee of the Whole (Committee Chair Veneman)

-  **FPPC-1** Update on the Management Study Mandated by the 1999 Budget Act
-  **FPPC-2** First Quarter Report of Revenues and Expenditures for Fiscal Year 1999-2000
-  **FPPC-3** Proposed 2000-2001 Budget Change Proposal Related to the Implementation of Assembly Bill 471 (Scott) Pertaining to Mandated Credential Reporting
-  **FPPC-4** Status of the Commission's Year 2000 Readiness

### 4. Preparation Standards Committee of the Whole (Committee Chair Sutro)


-  **PREP-1** Approval of Subject Matter Preparation Programs by Colleges & Universities and Accelerated Approval of Professional Preparation Programs
-  **PREP-2** Recommendations Related to Requirements for the Pupil Personnel Credential in School Psychology
-  **PREP-3** Recommendations Related to the Reciprocity Study Under AB 1620  
(Note: Large file...Please allow sufficient time for downloading)
-  **PREP-4** A Report on Teaching Internship Grant Programs 1994-1999: Lessons Learned & Challenges to Face
-  **PREP-5** Proposed Application for Title VII Career Ladder Funding From the U.S. Department of Education
-  **PREP-6** Policy Developments and Issues Related to the Delivery of Instructional Services to English Learners

### 5. Credentials & Certificated Assignments Committee of the Whole (Committee Chair Dauterive)

-  **C&CA-1** Annual Report on the Numbers of Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Credentials Issued by the Commission Upon the Recommendation of California Institutions of Higher Education with Commission-Approved Programs
-  **C&CA-2** Recommended Policy Related to the Teaching of Struggling Readers
-  **C&CA-3** Demonstration of the Commission's Automated Phone System (CAPS)

6. **Special Presentation** 1:00 p.m.

7. **Public Hearing** 1:30 p.m.

-  **PUB-1** Proposed Addition of Section 80014.3 and Amendment to Section 80066 of Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Concerning Teaching Reading as a Separate Subject on a Basic Teaching Credential and the Reading and Language Arts Specialist Teaching Credential

### 8. Reconvene General Session (Chair Norton)

- GS-10** Report of the Appeals and Waivers Committee
- GS-11** Report of Closed Session Items
- GS-12** Commissioners Reports
- GS-13** Audience Presentations

**GS-14**

Old Business

•Quarterly Agenda for November & December 1999 & January 2000

**GS-15**

New Business

**GS-16**

Nominations for Chairperson and Vice Chairperson of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

**GS-17**

Adjournment

**All Times Are Approximate and Are Provided for Convenience Only**

**Except Time Specific Items Identified Herein (i.e. Public Hearing)**

**The Order of Business May be Changed Without Notice**

Persons wishing to address the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing on a subject to be considered at this meeting are asked to complete a Request Card and give it to the Recording Secretary prior to the discussion of the item.

**Reasonable Accommodation for Any Individual with a Disability**

Any individual with a disability who requires reasonable accommodation to attend or participate in a meeting or function of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing may request assistance by contacting the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing at 1900 Capitol Avenue, Sacramento, CA 95814; telephone, (916) 445-0184.

**NEXT MEETING**

**December 1-2, 1999**

**California Commission on Teacher Credentialing**

**1900 Capitol Avenue**

**Sacramento, CA 95814**



[Top](#) | [CA Home Page](#) | [Governor's Home Page](#) | [About the Commission](#) | [Credential Information](#) | [Examination Information](#)

[Coded Correspondence](#) | [Credential Alerts](#) | [Educational Standards](#) | [Reports-on-Line](#) | [Committee on Accreditation](#)

[Troops to Teachers](#) | [Other Sites of Interest](#) | [Home](#)



## California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

**Meeting of:** November 3-4, 1999

**Agenda Item Number:** LEG-1

**Committee:** Legislative

**Title:** Status of Bills of Interest to the Commission

- ✓ Action
- ✓ Information

**Prepared by:** Rod Santiago  
Office of Governmental Relations

---

### PART I BILLS FOLLOWED BY THE CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING October 20, 1999

#### CCTC-Sponsored Bills

Bill Number - Author Subject	Previous and Current CCTC Position (date adopted)	Status
AB 309 - Mazzoni Would increase the cap on per intern expenditures in the alternative certification program	<b>Sponsor (3/99)</b>	Senate Appropriations Committee
AB 457 - Scott Would add internet-based sex offenses to the list of specified mandatory revocation offenses	<b>Sponsor (3/99)</b>	Signed by the Governor-- Chaptered
AB 466 - Mazzoni Omnibus clean-up bill	<b>Sponsor (3/99)</b>	Signed by the Governor-- Chaptered
AB 471 - Scott Would require CCTC to report to the Legislature and the Governor on numbers of teachers who received credentials, internships and emergency permits	<b>Sponsor (3/99)</b>	Signed by the Governor-- Chaptered
AB 1067 - Margett Would bring Education Code provisions related to lewd and lascivious Penal Code violations into conformity	<b>Sponsor (4/99)</b>	Signed by the Governor-- Chaptered
AB 1282 - Jackson Would require CCTC to make improvements needed to enhance CBEST	<b>Sponsor (4/99)</b>	Signed by the Governor-- Chaptered

## SENATE BILLS OF INTEREST TO CCTC

Bill Number - Author Subject	Previous and Current CCTC Position (date adopted)	Status
SB 151 - Haynes Would allow a person who meets prescribed requirements to qualify for a Professional Clear teaching credential	Seek Amendments (2/99) Oppose Unless Amended (4/99) <b>Oppose (7/99)</b>	Held in Assembly Appropriations Committee
SB 179 - Alpert Would establish model alternative teacher preparation programs	<b>Support if Amended (2/99)</b>	Held in Senate Appropriations Committee
SB 237 - Karnette Would require that a person may not qualify for an Administrative Services Credential unless he or she has ten years of teaching experience	<b>Oppose (3/99)</b>	Senate Education Committee
SB 395 - Hughes remove the sunset date on SDAIE staff development training	Seek Amendments (4/99) <b>Support (7/99)</b>	Signed by the Governor-- Chaptered
SB 472 - Poochigian Would establish a pilot program to provide grants to school districts using a mathematics specialist to teach mathematics aligned to the statewide content standards in grades 4, 5, and 6	<b>Support (4/99)</b>	Held in Senate Appropriations Committee
SB 489 - Solis Would make findings and declarations related to educational paraprofessionals	<b>Watch (4/99)</b>	Senate Rules Committee
SB 573 - Alarcon Would create a telecommunications-based pilot project in LA county for the purpose of providing support for BTSA or pre-intern teachers in hard to staff schools	Watch (4/99) <b>Support if Amended (5/99)</b>	Held in Senate Appropriations Committee
SB 883 - Haynes Would require CCTC to monitor the performance of graduates of various IHEs that provide educator preparation and would authorize CCTC to take administrative action against specified IHEs	<b>Oppose (4/99)</b>	Senate Education Committee
SB 1061 - Schiff Would waive the credential application fee for first-time specified credential applicants	<b>Support (4/99)</b>	Held in Senate Appropriations Committee
SB 1076 - Vasconcellos Makes findings and declarations related to teacher preparation and credentialing and expresses legislative intent to enact legislation to redesign teacher preparation and credentialing to teach teachers both the process of teaching and the information the teacher is responsible for their pupils learning	<b>Watch (4/99)</b>	Senate Education Committee
SB 1262 - O'Connell/Karnette Would amend the Golden State Scholarshare Trust Act <b>NOTE: Original bill language was incorporated into AB 1117 which has been</b>	<b>Support (4/99)</b>	Signed by the Governor-- Chaptered

<b>Signed by the Governor</b>		
SB 1309 - Baca Would require CCTC to regularly notify school districts about laws governing assignment of individuals when certificated teachers are not available	Oppose (4/99) <b>Watch (9/99)</b>	Signed by the Governor-- Chaptered

#### ASSEMBLY BILLS OF INTEREST TO CCTC

<b>Bill Number - Author Subject</b>	<b>Previous and Current CCTC Position (date adopted)</b>	<b>Status</b>
AB 1X - Villaraigosa and Strom-Martin Would establish the Peer Assistance and Review Program for Teachers	<b>Seek Amendments (2/99)</b> CTC amendments adopted	Signed by the Governor-- Chaptered
AB 2X - Mazzoni and Cunneen Would establish various programs related to reading and teacher recruitment	Support (2/99) <b>Seek Amendments (3/99)</b> CTC amendments adopted	Signed by the Governor-- Chaptered
AB 6 - Calderon Establishes the California Teacher Academy Program	<b>Seek Amendments (2/99)</b> CTC amendments adopted	Held in Assembly Appropriations Committee
AB 17X - Bates Would delete option for local development by IHEs of a teaching performance assessment and require CCTC to administer the assessment	<b>Oppose (2/99)</b>	Dropped by the author
AB 18X - Zettel and Bates Would require all teaching credential holders to pass a subject matter exam to renew the credential. Would require CCTC to establish a Peer Review Task Force	<b>Oppose Unless Amended (2/99)</b>	Dropped by the authors
AB 25X - Baldwin Would make changes to statutes governing the demonstration of subject matter competence	<b>Oppose (2/99)</b>	Dropped by the author
AB 27X - Leach Would require CCTC to conduct a validity study of the CBEST	Oppose Unless Amended (2/99) CTC amendments adopted <b>Watch (3/99)</b>	Signed by the Governor-- Chaptered
AB 28X - Leach Would make changes to statutes governing the accreditation framework	<b>Oppose (2/99)</b>	Held in Assembly Education Committee
AB 31 - Reyes Extends APLE Program to applicants who agree to provide classroom instruction in school districts serving rural areas	<b>Support (2/99)</b>	Signed by the Governor-- Chaptered
AB 108 - Mazzoni Subject Matter Projects	<b>Support (2/99)</b>	Held in Senate Appropriations Committee
AB 192 - Scott Would create the California Teacher Cadet	<b>Support (3/99)</b>	Vetoed by the Governor

Program		
AB 578 - Honda Would require SPI, in consultation with CCTC and IHEs, to develop training requirements for teachers to ensure sufficient training on domestic violence recognition	<b>Watch (4/99)</b>	Held in Senate Appropriations Committee
AB 615 - Runner Would place specified categorical funding programs into block grant programs	Oppose Unless Amended (6/99) <b>Watch (9/99)</b>	Senate Education Committee
AB 707 - House Would set forth requirements for a services credential with a specialization in school psychology	<b>Seek Amendments (4/99)</b>	Senate Education Committee
AB 752 - Davis Would create two new single subject teaching credentials in dance and in theatre	<b>Watch (4/99)</b>	Held in Assembly Appropriations Committee
AB 770 - Honda Would create a Middle Grades Certificate Program	<b>Seek Amendments (4/99)</b>	Held in Assembly Appropriations Committee
AB 899 - Alquist Would provide that on and after July 1, 2003 a teacher may not be initially assigned to teach math or science at the middle school level unless she or he holds a credential or supplementary authorization in the subject to be taught	<b>Support (5/99)</b>	Held in Assembly Appropriations Committee
AB 908 - Alquist Would require CCTC to adopt or revise standards to address gender equity	<b>Seek Amendments (4/99)</b>	Senate Appropriations Committee
AB 949 - Wiggins Would include holders of services credentials in the definition of teacher for the purposes of participating in the APLE program, the California Mentor Teacher Program, and the BCLAD Certificate	<b>Oppose Unless Amended (4/99)</b>	Assembly Education Committee
AB 961 - Steinberg Would create the Challenged School Teacher Attraction and Retention Act of 1999	<b>Support (4/99)</b>	Senate Education Committee
AB 1006 - Ducheny Would establish a two-year pilot project to provide peer support and mentoring for school counselors	<b>Support (4/99)</b>	Senate Education Committee
AB 1059 - Ducheny Would make various provisions in law related to CLAD training	Seek Amendments (4/99) <b>Support (9/99)</b>	Signed by the Governor-- Chaptered
AB 1242 - Lempert Would require CCTC to issue a California Preliminary (CAP) Credential to persons meeting certain requirements	Seek Amendments (4/99) Oppose (6/99) <b>Watch (9/99)</b>	Signed by the Governor-- Chaptered
AB 1294 - Firebaugh Would require CCTC, SPI, and directors of teacher education at IHEs to produce an annual report related to teacher recruitment, education, and retention programs	Watch (4/99) <b>Oppose (5/99)</b>	Assembly Education Committee

AB 1296 - Firebaugh Would authorize holders of emergency permits and Pre-Intern program participants to participate in BTSA. Would also establish a hard-to-staff school program	Watch (4/99) <b>Seek Amendments (5/99)</b>	Assembly Education Committee
---	---	------------------------------------

**PART II**  
**Provisions of the Chaptered Bills and Related Funding**

**COMMISSION-SPONSORED MEASURES**

**Assembly Bill 457**

AB 457 (Scott, Chapter 281, Statutes of 1999) takes effect January 1, 2000. This amends current law to require the revocation, or denial of a credential, upon the conviction of a crime involving the sale, possession, transport, distribution, or publication of obscene and pornographic material. AB 457 specifically targets trafficking of obscene and pornographic material to minors via computers, CD-ROM, computer software, or the Internet.

**Assembly Bill 466**

AB 466 (Mazzoni, Chapter 623, Statutes of 1999) takes effect immediately. This bill contains a variety of "clean-up" items that will affect several divisions of the Commission. Specifically this bill does the following (affected division in parentheses):

- A. **Reading Requirement for Single Subject Teaching Credentials: (CAW)**  
Applicants for Single Subject Teaching Credentials can meet the reading requirement by completing a reading course. They can no longer meet this requirement by successfully completing the *Praxis Introduction to the Teaching of Reading* examination. (The Multiple Subject Teaching Credential applicants take RICA.)
- B. **Demonstration of Computer Competency: (PS, CAW)** This bill provides an alternative route for credential candidates to verify computer competence. This alternative allows teacher credential candidates to demonstrate their computer competence on an exam rather than completing coursework.
- C. **Special Education Teachers Prepared in Other States: (CAW, IMS)** This measure allows an out-of-state trained special education teacher to obtain a two-year preliminary teaching credential pending the completion of:
  - 1. subject matter competence
  - B. a course or exam in the teaching of reading
  - C. U.S. Constitution
  - D. computer requirement
  - E. a course in non-special education pedagogy
  - F. supervised field experience in regular education
- D. **RICA Exam Requirements: (CAW)** AB 466 corrects the drafting error in the 1998 law by exempting candidates for preschool special education *credentials* as well as certificates from taking the RICA exam.
- E. **Education Specialist Instruction Pre-Intern Teaching Certificate: (PS, CAW, IMS)** This measure allows the Commission to issue pre-intern teaching certificates instead of emergency education specialist permits when resources remain after funding pre-interns pursuing multiple subject teaching credentials.
- F. **Clinical or Rehabilitative Services Employment Option for School Districts: (CAW)** AB 466 allows school districts to employ state licensed speech and language therapists who have passed CBEST and been cleared of any criminal history.
- G. **Exam Validity Studies Mandated by Current Law: Deficiency Identified by the Department of Finance: (PS)** AB 466 provides \$700,000 in spending authority within the Teacher Credentials Fund to allow the Commission to complete mandated CBEST and MSAT validity studies on time.

**Assembly Bill 471**

AB 471 (Scott, Chapter 381, Statutes of 1999) takes effect January 1, 2000. Specifically, AB 471 does two things:

- 1. **Provides State Policymakers Regular Information on the Nature, Extent and Scope of the Teacher Shortage (CAW):** Requires the Commission to report by January 10 of each year on:



the number of classroom teachers who received credentials, internships, and emergency permits in the previous fiscal year; the number of individuals serving on university internships, district internships, pre-internships, emergency permits and credential waivers by subject matter, county and school district; and the total number of teacher credentials recommended by the University of California, California State University, independent colleges and universities and other institutions that offer teacher preparation programs approved by the Commission; and

2. **Reduces the Reliance by School Districts on Emergency Permits and Waivers by Establishing a Sequence When Hiring Teachers (CAW):** Requires school districts to make every effort to recruit a fully prepared teacher for the assignment. If a fully prepared teacher is not available, the district shall make reasonable efforts to recruit for an individual in the following order:
  - A. A candidate who is scheduled to complete initial preparation requirements within six months.
  - B. A candidate who is qualified to participate in an approved internship program in the region of the school district.

If a suitable individual who meets the above priorities is not found, then the district may request approval for placement of an individual who does not meet the criteria mentioned above.

### **Assembly Bill 1067**

AB 1067 (Margett, Chapter 710, Statutes of 1999) takes effect January 1, 2000. The bill removes statutory inconsistencies by making the grounds for denial or revocation of a credential identical. AB 1067 amends the Education Code to specify that the Commission shall immediately revoke the holder's credential(s) or deny an application for a credential upon the conviction of:

1. offenses involving "lewd and lascivious" conduct under Penal Code section 272;
2. offenses involving the assault of a child under 8 years of age by a custodian of that child and the infliction of cruel or inhuman punishment upon a child under Penal Code sections 273ab and 273d; or
3. an equivalent offense committed or attempted in other states or under federal law.

### **Assembly Bill 1282**

AB 1282 (Jackson, Chapter 704, Statutes of 1999) takes effect January 1, 2000. Specifically, AB 1282 does two things:

1. **Maintains the solvency of the California Basic Educational Skills Test (PS):** The current statutory fee level of \$40 will remain in place until 2002. After January 1, 2002, the amount of the fee will be established by the Commission to recover the cost of examination administration and development.
2. **Increases the opportunities for future teachers to take the CBEST examination (PS):** This measure authorizes the Commission to make improvements to increase access to the exam for future teachers, which may include, but are not limited to:
  - administering the test more frequently;
  - increasing the number of testing locations; and
  - making the exam available at secure test centers.

## **MEASURES NOT SPONSORED BY THE COMMISSION**

### **Senate Bill 395**

SB 395 (Hughes, Chapter 685, Statutes of 1999) takes effect January 1, 2000. The bill extends the existing sunset date on SB 1969 training. Previously, a teacher was required to have been a permanent employee by January 1, 1995 in order to take advantage of this training. This bill moves that date to January 1, 2000. The bill also includes the following provisions:

1. Moves the deadline for completion of the required staff development from January 1, 2000 to January 1, 2005.
2. Authorizes a teacher who completes the staff development in methods of specially designed content instruction delivered in English to provide that instruction and instruction for English language development in any departmentalized teaching assignment consistent with the authorization of the teacher's basic teaching

credential.

3. Requires the commission to issue the certificates of completion upon submittal of the application and the proper documentation. The fee for the certificate must be set by the commission but must not exceed \$45.
4. Requires CTC to review the staff development programs.

### **Assembly Bill 1059**

AB 1059 (Ducheny, Chapter 711, Statutes of 1999) takes effect January 1, 2000. The bill includes the following provisions:

1. Requires CCTC to ensure that all accredited teacher preparation programs satisfy standards for the preparation of teachers of all pupils, including English Language Learners (ELL), by July 1, 2002 based upon an independent job analysis.
2. Requires CCTC to provide candidates with an examination route to fulfilling the requirements for essential preparation that all classroom teachers need to assist ELL students.
3. Requires CCTC to provide for a validity study of the exam route.
4. Beginning July 1, 2003 prohibits the Commission from issuing a preliminary teaching credential to an applicant unless she or he has completed the new requirements for preparation to assist ELL students, provided that a valid exam route is in place.
5. Beginning July 1, 2003, requires all approved beginning teacher induction programs to satisfy standards for beginning teacher induction for teachers for all pupils, including preparation needed by all teachers to assist ELL to access the curriculum.
6. Beginning July 1, 2005 prohibits the Commission from issuing an initial professional clear teaching credential unless the applicant has completed a beginning teacher induction program that satisfies standards for beginning teacher induction assisting ELL students.
7. Requires the Commission to complete various reports beginning July 1, 2000.

### **Assembly Bill 1242**

AB 1242 (Lempert, Chapter 737, Statutes of 1999) takes effect January 1, 2000. However, this measure must be funded in order to be implemented. When funded, this bill will create a new credential [a California Preliminary credential (CAP)] for someone who holds a postbaccalaureate degree, has 5 or more years of practice in the field of the degree, passes CBEST, and is recommended by a governing board of a school district for the credential.

Any governing board electing to recommend a person for this credential must enroll candidates in a preservice training program for a minimum of 40 hours of pedagogical training that is aligned with the California Standards for the Teaching Profession. The recommending governing board must also develop an individual program of professional preparation consisting of not less than 150 hours of study for each candidate to pursue professional development.

Each CAP credential shall be initially issued for two years. During these first two years the holder must complete an individual program of professional preparation and demonstrate basic pedagogical skills by passing the teaching performance assessment that is adopted by the commission.

Upon completion of these requirements, the holder can renew the document for another two-year period. During this period the holder must participate in a two-year induction program, demonstrate teaching competence by passing an assessment, and establish subject matter competence. When these requirements are completed, a professional clear credential may be issued.

The bill requires CCTC to report to the Legislature on the credential by February 1, 2004 and sunsets the CAP credential on January 1, 2005.





# California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

**Meeting of:** November 3-4, 1999

**Agenda Item Number:** PERF-1

**Committee:** Performance Standards

**Title:** Report on Extant Teaching Performance Assessments for Beginning Teachers

✓ Information

**Prepared by:** Terry Janicki, Ph.D., Consultant  
Professional Services Division

## Summary of an Agenda Report

### A Report on Extant Teaching Performance Assessments for Beginning Teachers

Professional Services Division  
October 20, 1999

#### Overview of this Report

The Commission on Teaching Credentialing has been provided the opportunity, through recent legislation (SB 1422), to restructure the standards and procedures for teacher preparation assessment and certification. The demonstrated teaching competence of credential candidates, as measured by a standardized assessment, is an integral part of this restructured system. Before making policy decisions on important aspects of a teaching performance assessment for use in California, the Commission expressed an interest in the collection of information on teaching performance assessments developed for use outside of California. The contract for preparing the report on extant teaching performance assessments for beginning teachers was awarded to Ms. Linda Wurzbach of Resources for Learning. Ms. Wurzbach's completed study was referred to by the SB 2042 Advisory Panel in their discussions of a teaching performance assessment for use in California. A summary of the report of teaching performance assessments is provided in this agenda report. The full report, titled Works in Progress, follows this report as Attachment to PERF-1.

#### Relationship to the Commission's Strategic Goals and Objectives

*Goal One:* To promote educational excellence in California schools.

*Objective One:* Develop candidate and program standards.

*Objective Two:* Develop and administer teacher assessments.

#### Fiscal Impact Statement

The cost to the contractor for preparing the report of teacher performance assessments outside of California was supported from the agency's base budget.

#### Recommendation

This is an information item only. The Commission is not expected to take action with respect to the report.

## Background

Recent legislation in California (SB 1422) provides an opportunity for the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) to restructure the standards and procedures for teacher preparation assessment and certification. The restructured system will rely heavily on the demonstrated teaching competence of credential candidates as measure by a standardized assessment of teaching performance, which has not previously been developed or used in California's teacher preparation and certification system. The design, scope, and methodology of the teaching performance assessment have not been decided. Before making these policy decisions, the Commission demonstrated an interest in collecting reliable information about teaching performance assessments that have been (and are being) developed for use outside of California, either by other states or by nationwide organizations.

In April 1998, the Executive Director, Dr. Sam W. Swofford released a request for proposals to compile information and provide analysis about teaching performance assessments that have been developed for use outside of California. The primary purpose of such a task was to provide a report to inform the SB2042 Advisory Panel and assist them in their considerations of the scope, content, and methodology of a teaching performance assessment for use in California.

## Request for Proposal: The Scope of Work

The Request for Proposal guidelines indicated that the Commission was open to any reasonable approach from prospective bidders; however, it was suggested that the data collection phase of this work would be conducted entirely by telephone, letter, or electronic means. Extensive and expensive on-site visits by the contractor to work sites outside of California were not considered essential to the study. The scope of work consisted of two phases: gathering assessment information and evaluating assessment designs.

**Phase One: Gathering Assessment Information.** The contractor was expected to collect and compile descriptive information about teaching performance assessments that have been developed and are being implemented outside of California, those that have been developed and are to be implemented in the near future outside of California, and any that are under development outside of California.

The contractor was expected to gather available information about the following aspects of each assessment.

- 1) **Pedagogical aspects of each assessment:** the scope and content of the assessment, the scoring criteria, the groups of new teachers for whom the assessment is designed, and the underlying assumptions about good teaching that the assessment is based on.
- 2) **Administrative aspects of each assessment:** including, but not limited to, the costs of developing and administering the assessment, the teacher time consumed by the assessment, the assessor time consumed by the assessment, the availability of training materials for assessors, and the administrative demands of the assessment.
- 3) **Effects of each assessment:** including, but not limited to, information about how well the assessment works in practice, its successes and pitfalls, how the results are or were distributed, the overall passing rates for important subgroups of teachers, and the reactions of teachers, teacher union leaders, school administrators and parents to the assessment.

**Phase Two: Evaluating Assessment Designs.** The contractor was to analyze, interpret, and evaluate the descriptive information compiled as a result of the information-gathering phase (above). The contractor was to prepare a written report that organizes the descriptive information for effective policy determinations, and that includes the contractor's analysis and evaluation of assessment options as complex as California.

## Results of the Request for Proposal Process

Linda Wurzbach, of Resources for Learning, was awarded the contract for under \$12,000 and began her work in July 1998. Her completed report, Works in Progress, was submitted to the Commission in September 1998. Below are summaries of her methodology and results. Works in Progress is included in Attachment to PERF 1.

## Methodology

State education agency and professional standards board Internet web sites provided background information. Personnel working with each assessment program were interviewed to obtain details of the assessment. Appendix II of Works in Progress contains a summary of each testing program or performance assessment effort. A list of contacts is included in Appendix III of Works in Progress, and a prototype of the interview questionnaire is found in Appendix IV of the report. Print references pertaining to each project follow each summary in Works in Progress.

Though the focus of this study was on beginning teacher performance assessments used for licensure, other educator performance assessments and a few state profiles were also included. This study presents some examples of the significant

efforts in performance-based assessment and licensure occurring in the United States, but does not purport to be a complete review of all such efforts.

## Results

The results of Ms. Wurzbach's study of performance assessments outside of California are presented in three parts in the attached Works in Progress report:

- A brief history of teacher performance assessments
- Shared assumptions among those developing and implementing teacher performance assessments
- Types and qualities of beginning teacher performance assessments

The appendices of Works in Progress contain numerous tables providing data on the various assessments under development and in use, a brief description of each of the states or testing programs interviewed for this study, and a list of contacts.

## Conclusions

There are no clear answers or solutions for state policymakers presented in the report of performance-based teacher assessments. Instead, Works in Progress concludes with a series of questions for states to consider as they move forward to implement performance-based licensure systems as one lever to promote school reform:

- What is the purpose of the assessment? What do you hope it will achieve?
- Who are the stakeholder groups who should be at the table from Day One of your planning? How can you ensure that all voices, including those that disagree, are heard?
- To what extent do political forces in the state (e.g., governor, state legislature, and teacher unions) support the initiative?
- What resources, fiscal and human, are available to support development or adoption, including field-testing in your state?
- What are the non-negotiable parts of this assessment system? What are you willing to give up?
- Will teacher preparation programs and/or local school districts have a role in your assessment program? If so, what do they have to gain?
- What is the maximum time and dollar burden that you can impose on teachers or beginning teachers?
- How will you provide support to beginning teachers? How will such support be structured and paid for? How will support providers be compensated?
- How can technology be used to facilitate development, administration, and scoring?
- What model will be used for scoring?
- What is the maximum acceptable turn around time between the performance assessment event and score reporting to candidates? What level of feedback will you provide to candidates?
- How will you determine the effectiveness of your assessment in achieving its goals?

---

# ATTACHMENT TO PERF-1

**AGENDA ITEM Number:** PERF - 1

**COMMITTEE:** Performance Standards

**TITLE:** Works in Progress, A Guide to Performance-Based Assessments for Beginning Teachers  
(Not Available On-Line)

---

[Back to the Top](#) |  
[Back to November 1999 Agenda](#)  
[Return to "Agenda Archives"](#) |  
[Return to "About CTC"](#) |





## California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

**Meeting of:** November 3-4, 1999

**Agenda Item Number:** PERF-2

**Committee:** Performance Standards

**Title:** Annual Report on the Multiple Subjects Assessment for Teachers (MSAT): October 1992-June 1999

✓ Action

**Prepared by:** Bethany Brunsman, Ph.D., Consultant  
Professional Services Division

---

### Summary of an Agenda Report

**Annual Report on the Multiple Subjects Assessment for Teachers  
(MSAT): October 1992 - June 1999**

**Professional Services Division  
October 19, 1999**

#### Overview of this Report

The Commission has a responsibility to periodically assemble, interpret, and publish the results of the examinations it uses to verify the qualifications of prospective educators. The draft report entitled *Annual Report on the Multiple Subjects Assessment for Teachers (MSAT): October 1992 - June 1999* that follows this agenda report (as Attachment to PERF &mdash;2) is the second annual report describing the participation and performance of examinees on the MSAT examination used to verify subject matter knowledge for Multiple Subject Teaching Credentials. The report provides information about the MSAT exam and its development, administration, and scoring; presents preparation and demographic data about examinees who took the MSAT from October 1992 through June 1999; and provides information about examinee performance (i.e., passing rates) on the exams.

#### Relationship to the Commission's Strategic Goals and Objectives

*Goal One:* To promote educational excellence in California schools.

*Objective One:* Develop candidate and program standards.

*Objective Two:* Develop and administer teacher assessments.

#### Fiscal Impact Statement

The costs of preparing the report are supported from the agency's base budget.

#### Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Commission accept the draft report entitled *Annual Report on the Multiple Subjects Assessment for Teachers (MSAT): October 1992 - June 1999* and authorize staff to finalize it and make it available to interested parties.

The Commission issues Multiple Subject Teaching Credentials that authorize the teaching of all subjects in a self-contained classroom and two or more subjects to the same group of students in a core classroom. One of the requirements to earn a Multiple Subject Teaching Credential is verification of subject matter competence. Prospective teachers have two alternative ways to meet this requirement: (1) completion of a Commission-approved program of subject matter preparation for self-contained classroom teaching, or (2) passage of the Multiple Subjects Assessment for Teachers (MSAT). California Education Code Section 44281 requires the Commission to administer subject matter examinations and assessments for the purpose of assuring adequate levels of subject matter knowledge for teachers who take the exams in lieu of completing approved subject matter programs.

The Commission adopted the MSAT as the examination to verify subject matter competence for the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential beginning in October 1992. Candidates for Multiple Subject Teaching Credentials who have not completed Commission-approved subject matter preparation programs must pass the MSAT examination.

The Commission has a responsibility to periodically assemble, interpret, and publish the results of the examinations it uses to verify the qualifications of prospective educators. Such reports enable the Commissioners and their diverse constituents to ascertain the effectiveness of the examinations and their impact on the overall system of teacher preparation in California. The publishing of reports on examination results is a public service strongly related to the Commission's function as the education licensing body in California.

The draft report entitled *Annual Report on the Multiple Subjects Assessment for Teachers (MSAT): October 1992 - June 1999* that follows this agenda report (as Attachment to PERF&emdash;2) is the second annual report describing the participation and performance of examinees on the MSAT examination used to verify subject matter knowledge for Multiple Subject Teaching Credentials. This report provides information about the MSAT exam and its development, administration, and scoring; presents preparation and demographic data about examinees who took the MSAT from October 1992 through June 1999; and provides information about examinee performance (i.e., passing rates) on the exam.

Staff recommends that the Commission accept the draft report and authorize staff to finalize it and make it available to interested parties.

ATTACHMENT TO PERF-2

AGENDA ITEM Number:	PERF - 2
COMMITTEE:	Performance Standards
TITLE:	Annual Report on the Multiple Subjects Assessment for Teachers (MSAT): October 1992 - June 1999

The attached draft report entitled *Multiple Subjects Assessment for Teachers (MSAT): October 1992 - June 1999* is an attachment to PERF-2 of the Commission's November 3-4, 1999, meeting.

[|Click here for Table of Contents|](#)

DRAFT

Annual Report on the Multiple Subjects  
Assessment for Teachers (MSAT)

October 1992 - June 1999





**Sacramento, California  
October 1999**

---

**DRAFT**

**Annual Report on the Multiple Subjects  
Assessment for Teachers (MSAT)**

**October 1992 - June 1999**

Authors:

Bethany A. Brunsman, Ph.D., Consultant  
Judy Oster, Research Analyst II  
Diane Tanaka, Research Analyst II

Professional Services Division



Robert E. Carlson, Jr., Ph.D., Administrator  
Professional Services Division

Robert Salley, Interim Director  
Professional Services Division

Sacramento, California  
October 1999

---

**California Commission on  
Teacher Credentialing**  
October 1999

**Members of the Commission**

Torrie L. Norton, Chairperson	Teacher
Gary Reed, Vice Chairperson	Public Representative
Melodie Blowers	School Board Member
Verna B. Dauterive	Administrator



Carolyn L. Ellner	Faculty Member
Scott Harvey	Public Representative
Carol Katzman	Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction
Helen Lee	Public Representative
Doris Miner	School Counselor
Edmund Sutro	Teacher
Jane Veneman	Teacher
Nancy Zarenda	Teacher

### **Ex-Officio Members**

Edward DeRoche	Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities
Elizabeth Graybill	California Postsecondary Education Commission
Jon Snyder	Regents, University of California
Bill Wilson	California State University

### **Executive Officer**

Sam W. Swofford, Ed.D.	Executive Director
------------------------	--------------------

## **Table of Contents**

### **List of Tables**

#### **Executive Summary**

Summary of Preparation and Demographic Data for MSAT Examinees

Summary of MSAT Passing Rates

#### **Part 1: Background Information**

#### **Part 2: Description, Development, Administration, and Scoring of the MSAT**

Description of the MSAT

Development of the MSAT

Administration of the MSAT

Scoring of the MSAT

#### **Part 3: Preparation and Demographic Data for Examinees and Passing Rates on the MSAT**

Preparation and Demographic Data

Passing Rates

#### **Appendix A: MSAT Specifications**

#### **Appendix B: Scoring Rubric for the MSAT Content Area Exercises**

#### **Appendix C: An Example of an MSAT Score Report**

### **List of Tables**

Table 1: [Number of Candidates Who Earned Multiple Subject Teaching Credentials and How They Satisfied the Subject Matter Requirement, 1996-97 to 1998-99](#)

Table 2: [Content Categories for the Content Knowledge Section](#)

Table 3: [Content Categories for the Content Area Exercises Section](#)

Table 4: [Numbers of MSAT Examinations Administered in 1998-99](#)

Table 5: [MSAT Passing Standards](#)

Table 6: [Preparation and Demographic Data for MSAT Participants](#)

Table 7: [Cumulative Passing Rates on the MSAT](#)

Table 8: [First-Time Passing Rates on the MSAT](#)

Table 9: [Cumulative and First-Time Passing Rates on the MSAT \(By Section\)](#)

Table 10: [Analysis of Cumulative Passing Rates on the MSAT \(By Section\)](#)

---

DRAFT

Annual Report on the  
Multiple Subjects Assessment for Teachers (MSAT)  
October 1992 - June 1999  
Executive Summary

The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing issues Multiple Subject Teaching Credentials that authorize the teaching of all subjects in a self-contained classroom and two or more subjects to the same group of students in a core classroom. One of the requirements to earn a Multiple Subject Teaching Credential is verification of subject matter competence. Prospective teachers have two alternative ways to meet this requirement: (1) completion of a Commission-approved program of subject matter preparation for self-contained classroom teaching, or (2) passage of the Multiple Subjects Assessment for Teachers (MSAT). California Education Code Section 44281 requires the Commission to administer subject matter examinations and assessments for the purpose of assuring adequate levels of subject matter knowledge for teachers who take the exams in lieu of completing approved subject matter programs.

The Commission adopted the MSAT as the examination to verify subject matter competence for the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential beginning in October 1992. This report is the second annual report describing the participation and performance of examinees on the MSAT examination used to verify subject matter knowledge for Multiple Subject Teaching Credentials. Candidates for Multiple Subject Teaching Credentials who have not completed Commission-approved subject matter preparation programs must pass the MSAT.

This report provides information about the MSAT exam and its development, administration, and scoring; presents preparation and demographic data about examinees who took the MSAT exam from October 1992 through June 1999; and provides information about examinee performance (i.e., passing rates) on the exam. Data are provided for three annual cohorts of participants. Each participant is assigned to a cohort based on the year the participant initially took one or both sections of the MSAT. For example, if a participant took the Content Knowledge section for the first time in 1995-96, and took the Content Area Exercises section for the first time in 1996-97, that participant was assigned to the 1995-96 cohort. Each participant is assigned to only one annual cohort.

The number of new MSAT examinees has increased from 1995-96 to 1998-99, with a decrease in volume in 1997-98. More than three-fourths of the MSAT participants either earned bachelor's degrees or have completed bachelor's degrees plus additional coursework. Relatively few of the participants were undergraduates.

The largest percentages of MSAT participants reported that they majored in social sciences, education, or English and humanities. Very few MSAT participants majored in mathematics or science. Almost two-thirds of MSAT participants earned undergraduate grade-point averages from 2.50 through 3.49. A little less than two-thirds of the MSAT participants reported that they received training relevant to the exam at a college or university in California. Relatively large percentages of the participants chose not to furnish this information, which is optional for registration.

With respect to demographic characteristics, the great majority of MSAT participants indicated that English was their best language of communication. More than three-fourths were females, and more than two-thirds described themselves as White. Relatively small percentages of the participants were ethnic minority group members.

### Summary of MSAT Passing Rates

The table below provides a summary of the cumulative and first-time passing rates on the MSAT exam. *To fully understand this table and the discussion that follows, the reader should read the description of the passing rate data in the section of this report entitled "Passing Rates."*

Summary of Passing Rates on the MSAT

	Cumulative Passing Rates			First-Time Passing Rates		
	N	Passed		N	Passed	
		N	%		N	%
MSAT Exam	49599	40164	81.0	66762	42122	63.1
Content Knowledge Section	49469	38668	78.2	66303	45258	68.3
Content Area Exercises Section	49018	35873	73.2	65701	40463	61.6

Overall, for the 1992-93 through 1997-98 cohorts combined, more than four-fifths (81%) of the participants passed the MSAT through June 1999. Passing rates are lower for the more recent 1997-98 cohort than they are for the 1996-97 or 1995-96 cohorts. This difference may be explained both by the fact that examinees in the 1997-98 cohort have had fewer opportunities to retake the exam and by differences in first-time passing rates for these groups. First-time passing rates have decreased over the latest four cohorts. Sixty-three percent of MSAT examinees passed both sections of the exam on their first attempt.

Success in passing the MSAT occurs more frequently for examinees who are well-prepared than for examinees who are less prepared. This finding provides evidence of the validity of the MSAT as a pass-fail licensure exam. Although the educational levels of participants have relatively little impact on passing rates, undergraduate major and undergraduate GPA are important factors. Overall, passing scores were earned by high percentages of participants who majored in the subjects that are included in the assessment: English/humanities, mathematics/natural sciences, and social sciences. A smaller percentage of participants who majored in education passed, perhaps because the MSAT does not assess pedagogical skill or knowledge.

Participants' academic success as undergraduate students was also strongly related to their MSAT performances. Success on the MSAT was substantially more frequent among participants whose undergraduate GPAs ranged from 3.5 through 4.0 than among others whose GPAs were below 3.5.

Some differences in cumulative passing rates related to the demographic characteristics of examinees emerged. Male participants passed at a somewhat higher rate than did females. Additionally, some ethnic groups passed at higher rates than other ethnic groups. Relatively high passing rates were earned by participants who described themselves as White, Asian American, or Native American. Somewhat lower passing rates were earned by Pacific Islanders, Latinos, Mexican Americans, Southeast Asians, and African Americans. Given the steps that the Commission and Educational Testing Service (ETS) have taken to eliminate bias from the MSAT, much of the ethnic group differences in passing rates may be attributable to differences in academic preparation, including preparation variables on which data have not been collected.

An analysis of cumulative passing rates suggests that first-time success rates are greater than success rates for repeaters. First, second, and third attempts account for a significant amount of the overall cumulative passing rate on each section of the MSAT. An examinee's chance of passing each section decreases with each unsuccessful attempt, probably because at least some of these examinees do not complete additional preparation. Many examinees drop out after one or two unsuccessful attempts and give up trying to pass the MSAT. Although approximately the same numbers of examinees take the two sections of the exam, examinees are more likely to stop trying after failed attempts on the MSAT Content Area Exercises than on the MSAT Content Knowledge.

The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing issues Multiple Subject Teaching Credentials that authorize the teaching of all subjects in a self-contained classroom and two or more subjects to the same group of students in a core classroom<sup>1</sup>. One of the requirements to earn a Multiple Subject Teaching Credential is verification of subject matter competence. Prospective teachers have two alternative ways to meet this requirement: (1) completion of a Commission-approved program of subject matter preparation for self-contained classroom teaching, or (2) passage of the Multiple Subjects Assessment for Teachers (MSAT). California Education Code Section 44281 requires the Commission to administer subject matter examinations and assessments for the purpose of assuring adequate levels of subject matter knowledge for teachers who take the exams in lieu of completing approved subject matter programs.

The Commission adopted the MSAT as the examination to verify subject matter competence for the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential beginning in October 1992. The Commission had previously adopted standards for the preparation of self-contained classroom teachers in these subject areas. By 1992, the Commission had also approved more than 50 subject matter programs on the basis of the standards, thus providing abundant opportunities of California teaching candidates to meet the subject matter requirement. However, more than half of all Multiple Subject Teaching Credentials are awarded not on the basis of subject matter preparation, but on the basis of subject matter competence using the MSAT (see [Table 1](#) on the next page).

**Table 1: Number of Candidates Who Earned Multiple Subject Teaching Credentials and How They Satisfied the Subject Matter Requirement, 1996-97 to 1998-99**

Year	Total Number of Teachers Credentialed*	Number Who Satisfied Subject Matter Requirement by Program	Number Who Satisfied Subject Matter Requirement by Exam	Percent Who Satisfied Subject Matter Requirement by Exam
------	--	--	---	--

1996-97	8,108	4,108	3,970	49%
1997-98	10,611	4,890	5,721	54%
1998-99	10,246	4,027	6,219	61%

\*Includes only "first time" and "new type" Five-Year Preliminary and Professional Clear Teaching Credentials.

Part 2

Description, Development, Administration, and Scoring of the MSAT

Description of the MSAT

The MSAT has two sections: Content Knowledge and Content Area Exercises. The Content Knowledge section is designed to measure the breadth of subject matter knowledge of prospective elementary teachers. It consists of 120 multiple-choice questions. Candidates have two hours to complete it. [Table 2](#) shows the content categories covered by the Content Knowledge section of the MSAT (please see [Appendix A](#) for the specific content specifications of the MSAT).

Table 2: Content Categories for the Content Knowledge Section

Content Categories Required by Law	Number of Questions	Percentage of Examination
Literature and Language Studies	24	20%
Mathematics	24	20%
Science	22	18%
History/Social Studies	22	18%
Visual and Performing Arts	12	10%
Physical Education	8	7%
Human Development	8	7%

The Content Area Exercises section of the MSAT consists of 18 short constructed-response questions, designed to measure examinees' depth of subject matter knowledge and higher-order thinking skills. Candidates have three hours to complete it. [Table 3](#) on the next page shows the content categories that are included in the Content Area Exercises section of the MSAT (see [Appendix A](#) for the detailed content specifications).

Table 3: Content Categories for the Content Area Exercises Section

Content Categories Required by Law	Number of Questions
Literature and Language Studies	3
Mathematics	3
Science	3
History/Social Studies	3
Visual and Performing Arts	2
Physical Education	2

## Development of the MSAT

Prior to 1992, the Commission used the NTE Core Battery Examination of General Knowledge to verify subject matter competence. In 1988, the Commission appointed an expert panel to examine the subject matter preparation of elementary school teachers and recommend needed changes. The panel consisted of elementary teachers, school principals, curriculum specialists, and professors of English, history, social science, natural science, mathematics, physical education, and the arts. The panel recommended that a new assessment be developed because the NTE Examination of General Knowledge did not include all of the content areas of elementary teaching as broadly as the new standards for elementary subject matter programs, and it did not include some subjects such as physical education and the performing arts at all. Moreover, the panel did not think that the NTE Exam's exclusively multiple-choice format measured important content skills or thinking processes well. Based on this advice and the requirements of Education Code Sections 44281 and 44282(b), the Commission decided to sponsor the development of the MSAT.

To develop the MSAT, the Commission appointed an Elementary Subject Matter Assessment Advisory Panel consisting of 27 elementary school teachers, principals, curriculum specialists, teacher educators, and college faculty members in several academic fields. This panel included some members from the panel that had previously developed the Commission's *Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Elementary Subject Matter Preparation Programs*. Other members of the panel had assisted the State Board of Education and the Department of Education in developing the *State Curriculum Frameworks and Guides for Elementary Schools*.

The Commission directed the Advisory Panel to design an assessment that would be as closely aligned as possible with the scope and content of California's *State Curriculum Frameworks* and the Commission's *Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Elementary Subject Matter Preparation Programs*. The panelists designed a structure for the assessment and developed detailed specifications for its content elements or "domains." In these specifications, the panel incorporated the major themes of the state curriculum policy documents as well as the Commission's new standards for elementary subject matter programs. The panel also recommended that the assessment include constructed-response questions to measure content-based skills and higher-order thinking, as well as multiple-choice questions to assess the breadth of each prospective teacher's content knowledge.

In February 1991, the Commission conducted a validity study of the importance of each of the MSAT specifications for the jobs of beginning elementary school teachers. More than 2,600 survey instruments were mailed to elementary teachers and administrators in randomly-selected schools in California, and to elementary teacher education faculty members in colleges and universities. The Commission received 405 responses. This review by elementary education professionals showed that the initial MSAT specifications generally focused on knowledge and skills that were important for elementary teachers. The Elementary Subject Matter Assessment Advisory Panel re-examined the MSAT specifications based on the survey results. The panel modified the original draft of specifications to focus them on the most important skill and knowledge domains for elementary school teaching jobs. The Commission then examined and adopted the revised specifications in 1991.

After the February 1991 validity study established the content validity of the MSAT specifications, the Elementary Subject Matter Assessment Advisory Panel worked closely with Educational Testing Service (ETS) in writing, pilot testing, and field testing new examination questions based on the validated content specifications for the MSAT. The panel developed scoring rubrics for the constructed-response items.

In August 1992, the Elementary Subject Matter Assessment Advisory Panel met to develop an interim passing standard for the MSAT. First, the panel participated in standard-setting procedures for the two sections of the assessment. They individually estimated the scores that a minimally-competent beginning teacher would earn, and they reached a group consensus about a passing standard. They recommended separate minimum thresholds and passing standards for the multiple-choice and constructed-response sections of the MSAT. They suggested the Commission use a compensatory scoring model to assess each candidate's subject matter competence.

After the first administration of the MSAT in October 1992, a second standard-setting study was completed. A group of 27 elementary teachers were asked the same questions to which the panel responded in August. The Advisory Panel then used this information along with data from the first administration of the MSAT to recommend revised passing standards for the MSAT. The Commission adopted the revised standards in January 1993.

In May 1993, the Commission conducted two additional validity studies related to the MSAT. The first of these two validity studies included 21 elementary teachers, school principals, curriculum specialists, and teacher educators from different regions of California. They included members of several ethnic groups: African American, Asian American, Mexican American, White, White Hispanic, and Other. The teaching experience of the participants ranged from less than 5 years to more than 20 years. The purposes of the study were:

- to examine the relevance of the MSAT specifications to the teaching curricula of elementary schools in California; and
- to examine the linkage of each exam question to the topics or abilities that it is intended to measure.

With respect to the MSAT specifications, participants were asked to determine (1) how important each specification was for beginning teachers in elementary schools, and (2) how well the specifications as a whole represented each subject area. Participants were also asked to review MSAT questions and determine how well each question was related to an identified specification. This study complemented the initial validity study related to the content specifications because it enabled a group of elementary educators to investigate MSAT issues in face-to-face dialogues. This validity study also enabled elementary school professionals to evaluate the quality of individual MSAT items. All of the specifications were judged to be important except for several specifications within the visual and performing arts. Participants also thought that the specifications represented the subject areas well, except for one specification in the area of human development. All of the reviewed multiple-choice and constructed-response questions were judged to be "good" or "somewhat good" measures of the adopted specifications.

The second validity study in May 1993 investigated the extent to which the content coverage and difficulty of the MSAT questions were consistent with required and elective courses in Commission-approved elementary subject matter (liberal studies) programs. The participants were 52 faculty members from 22 public and private universities and colleges in California. Most of these faculty members taught required and elective courses in the seven subject areas that are included in elementary subject matter programs. A few of the participants advised students in those programs. Each participant reviewed items that were related to his/her subject specialty area.

The university faculty members determined that most of the MSAT questions were based on content that is typically taught in elementary subject matter programs. Participants rated the MSAT questions in English, human development, and mathematics as very consistent with the content in *required* program courses. They thought some of the exam questions in science, social science (specifically economics), and visual and performing arts (specifically dance) were covered in *elective* courses that are commonly included in approved programs. However, they judged that the content in many of the physical education questions could only be learned in a *major* in the subject of physical education.

In terms of difficulty, most of the MSAT questions (78%) were judged to be consistent with pre-collegiate (high school) or general education coursework that is commonly completed in the freshman and sophomore years of college. About one-fifth (20%) of the items were related to courses that students would normally take in the junior or senior years of a liberal studies program, a major in the subject, or as elective courses. Participants in the study thought a small percentage of the items (2%) were not typically taught in undergraduate programs.

After the May 1993 validity studies were completed, the Elementary Subject Matter Assessment Advisory Panel reviewed the results and made recommendations to the Commission about changes in the MSAT. The Commission staff worked with ETS' test development staff to review the subject areas that were identified in the studies as too difficult or inconsistent with elementary subject matter programs and to incorporate changes in the MSAT items.

To ensure the validity and fairness of the MSAT, test questions are reviewed for bias on an ongoing basis. During the exam development process, trained ETS staff review questions and potential test forms for bias. If the reviewer has sensitivity-related concerns about a test question or a test form, the reviewer and the test developer work together to resolve the issues. If the issues cannot be resolved, the test question or form goes to an arbitration panel of individuals internal and external to ETS, who then reach a consensus about whether the question or form conforms to ETS sensitivity review guidelines and procedures.

New MSAT constructed-response test questions are pilot-tested at California colleges and universities before they are included in a form. Trained California scorers then read the questions and pilot-test responses and judge the clarity, appropriateness, ease of scoring, and fairness of the questions. Test questions are revised or discarded based on these evaluations.

**Administration of the MSAT**

Both sections of the MSAT are currently administered five times a year, up from four times a year in 1996-97, by Educational Testing Service (ETS) at 37 exam centers in California. ETS also offers the MSAT at over 500 exam centers throughout the United States. Registration is available through the mail, internet, and telephone (for candidates who have previously registered for a Praxis Series exam in the last five years).

Alternative testing arrangements are available for individuals who cannot take the assessment on Saturday due to religious convictions or U.S. military duties, and for individuals who have disabilities. These arrangements include additional time, separate testing rooms, special seating arrangements, enlarged-print exam books, large-block answer sheets, sign language interpreters, and colored overlays. Examinees whose primary language is not English can also request additional time to complete the MSAT questions.

Table 4 shows the numbers of MSAT exams (by section) administered in 1998-99. Some participants took one or more sections on more than one occasion in 1998-99. As a result, Table 4 contains a record of exams taken, not a count of individuals who took the MSAT exam that year.



**Table 4: Numbers of MSAT Examinations Administered in 1998-99**

MSAT Section	Number of Exams Administered
MSAT Content Knowledge	24,582
MSAT Content Area Exercises	23,577

### Scoring of the MSAT

For the Content Area Exercises, each examinee's response to each question is rated by an experienced teacher or teacher educator who has been trained to rate MSAT responses. Raters are carefully selected, trained, supervised, and monitored in order to ensure highly reliable scores. They use a holistic scoring rubric (see [Appendix B](#)). Raw scores for each response range from zero (0) for an off-topic response to three (3) for a complete and accurate response.

The Content Knowledge section is machine scored. Examinee raw scores on each section of the MSAT are converted to scaled scores, which range from 100 to 200. The scaling process compensates for minor variations in the technical characteristics of the assessment, which may occur from administration to administration, and is intended to ensure a constant passing standard for all examinees across time.

ETS mails score reports to examinees four to six weeks after the MSAT is administered. The score report shows the examinee's scores and indicates whether the examinee met the minimum score for each section and the total passing score for both sections. For examinees who have taken the MSAT more than once, the score report shows the examinee's cumulative record on the assessment. The score report also shows the examinee's raw score in each subject area in relation to the total numbers of points that could be earned in that subject, and the scores earned by the middle fifty percent (50%) of all examinees on the same form of the MSAT. [Appendix C](#) contains an example of an MSAT score report. Examinees also receive a leaflet that helps them interpret and understand their MSAT scores. The Commission receives MSAT scores in electronic format from ETS. Examinees can also request that their scores be sent to colleges and universities.

[Table 5](#) shows the current passing standards for the MSAT. Because of the flexible model for compensatory scoring, examinees can pass the exam in two ways: by achieving at least the passing score on each section, or by achieving at least the overall passing score on the two sections combined and at least the minimum score on each section. As a result, a high score on one section can compensate for a lower score on the other section. To provide additional flexibility, the Commission allows examinees to combine passing and minimum scores from different administrations (forms) of the MSAT.

**Table 5: MSAT Passing Standards**

Exam Section	Minimum Score	Passing Score
MSAT Content Knowledge	148	156
MSAT Content Area Exercises	147	155
Overall MSAT Score		311

---

## Part 3

### Preparation and Demographic Data for Examinees and Passing Rates on the MSAT

This part of the report provides preparation and demographic data and passing rates for candidates who have taken the MSAT from October 1992 through June 1999. A description of the tables used to present the data is provided first. The description is followed by the tables and discussion of the data. ***To fully understand the tables and the related discussions, the reader needs to carefully read the descriptions.***

#### Preparation and Demographic Data



Table 6 provides preparation and demographic information about candidates who have taken one or both sections of the MSAT from October 1992 through June 1999. Data are provided separately for three annual cohorts of participants and overall for all participants from October 1992 through June 1999. Each participant is assigned to a cohort based on the year the participant initially took either section of the MSAT. For example, if a participant took the Content Knowledge section for the first time in 1995-96, and took the Content Area Exercises section for the first time in 1996-97, that participant was assigned to the 1995-96 cohort. Each participant is assigned to only one annual cohort.<sup>2</sup>

The data in Table 6 come from the MSAT registration form completed by candidates when they register to take either section of the exam.<sup>3</sup> The tables reflect the most current information available for each participant; that is, information from the most recent registration form(s) completed by the participant.

<sup>2</sup>The cohorts in this report are somewhat different from those used in the last annual report dated July 1998. In the July 1998 report, cohort years were defined from September through August. To be consistent with annual reports for other exams, cohorts in this report include examinees who began taking the MSAT between July 1 and June 30 in a given year.

<sup>3</sup>Beginning in 1998/99, examinees were asked to respond to additional background questions in a supplemental data questionnaire included with registration materials. This report does not contain analyses of this data, however, because the response rates were too low for data analyses to be meaningful and reliable.

With respect to examinee volumes, the number of new MSAT examinees has increased from 1995-96 to 1998-99, with a dip in volume in 1997-98. The 1995-96 cohort contained only 7,150 examinees compared to 17,163 in the 1998-99 cohort.

Under "Education Level," Table 6 shows that more than three-fourths of the MSAT participants (77%) either earned bachelor's degrees or have completed bachelor's degrees plus additional coursework. Another 12 percent of the participants earned Master's degrees or higher degrees. Relatively few of the participants were

Table 6: Preparation and Demographic Data for MSAT Participants

	Overall		Annual Cohorts of Participants					
	10/92 - 6/99		1998-99		1997-98		1996-97	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
All Participants	66,762	100.0	17,163	100.0	9,978	100.0	11,251	100.0
Educational Level								
Undergraduate	6,154	9.2	1,655	9.6	819	8.2	978	8.7
Bachelor's Degree	17,959	26.9	4,203	24.5	2,410	24.2	3,019	26.8
Bachelor's Degree + Units	33,580	50.3	8,540	49.8	5,439	54.5	5,842	51.9
Master's Degree and Above	7,787	11.7	1,954	11.4	1,166	11.7	1,376	12.2
Did Not Respond	1,282	1.9	811	4.7	144	1.4	36	0.3
Undergraduate College Major								
Education	15,066	22.6	3,662	21.3	2,534	25.4	2,820	25.1
English/Humanities	12,647	18.9	3,133	18.3	1,874	18.8	2,339	20.8
Math/Natural Sciences	3,193	4.8	765	4.5	588	5.9	696	6.2
Social Sciences	23,630	35.4	5,486	32.0	3,983	39.9	4,651	41.3
Vocational/Technical	3,203	4.8	1,750	10.2	382	3.8	379	3.4

Undecided	134	0.2	40	0.2	17	0.2	24	0.2
Did Not Respond	8,889	13.3	2,327	13.6	600	6.0	342	3.0
<hr/>								
<b>Undergraduate GPA</b>								
From 3.5 Through 4.0	13,582	20.3	3,889	22.7	2,220	22.2	2,409	21.4
From 2.5 Through 3.49	43,337	64.9	11,210	65.3	6,851	68.7	8,077	71.8
Below 2.5	3,626	5.4	979	5.7	655	6.6	656	5.8
Did Not Respond	6,217	9.3	1,085	6.3	252	2.5	109	1.0
<hr/>								
<b>Where Prepared</b>								
California	42,421	63.5	10,916	63.6	7,142	71.6	7,893	70.2
Outside of California	7,905	11.8	2,595	15.1	1,202	12.0	1,362	12.1
Did Not Respond	16,436	24.6	3,652	21.3	1,634	16.4	1,996	17.7
<hr/>								
<b>Best Language</b>								
English	62,779	94.0	15,681	91.4	9,447	94.7	10,758	95.6
Another Language	2,230	3.3	613	3.6	366	3.7	379	3.4
Did Not Respond	1,753	2.6	869	5.1	165	1.7	114	1.0
<hr/>								
<b>Gender</b>								
Female	51,759	77.5	13,411	78.1	7,736	77.5	8,694	77.3
Male	14,866	22.3	3,697	21.5	2,228	22.3	2,534	22.5
Did Not Respond	137	0.2	55	0.3	14	0.1	23	0.2
<hr/>								
<b>Ethnicity</b>								
African American	2,828	4.2	804	4.7	380	3.8	424	3.8
Asian American	2,792	4.2	806	4.7	477	4.8	543	4.8
Southeast Asian American	470	0.7	179	1.0	86	0.9	84	0.7
Pacific Islander	531	0.8	167	1.0	80	0.8	89	0.8
Mexican American	6,182	9.3	1,837	10.7	945	9.5	989	8.8
Latino or Other Hispanic	2,673	4.0	729	4.2	395	4.0	428	3.8
Native American, American Indian, Alaskan Native	502	0.8	120	0.7	73	0.7	84	0.7
White	45,293	67.8	10,596	61.7	6,766	67.8	7,986	71.0
Other	3,205	4.8	885	5.2	558	5.6	545	4.8
Did Not Respond	2,286	3.4	1,040	6.1	218	2.2	79	0.7
<hr/>								

undergraduates (9%), probably because they had not finished the relevant coursework. Annual cohort data in [Table 6](#) show that the education levels of MSAT participants change very little from year to year.

The largest percentages of MSAT participants reported that they majored in social sciences (35%), education (23%), or English and humanities (19%). Very few MSAT participants majored in mathematics or science (5%). The annual data indicate that year-to-year changes in undergraduate majors are small. Many of the reported education majors probably completed their preparation outside of California. In California, prospective elementary teachers complete undergraduate majors in content areas rather than education. The information about undergraduate majors may be somewhat misleading, however, because

some participants who prepared in California reported having completed education majors. Because the Commission was concerned that the other survey response options may not meaningfully describe the actual majors of these participants, the Commission's staff arranged to clarify the response categories in the background survey beginning with the 1998-99 testing year.

In the category called "Undergraduate GPA," almost two-thirds (65%) of MSAT participants earned undergraduate grade-point averages from 2.50 through 3.49. Approximately one-fifth of them (20%) earned GPAs from 3.50 through 4.00. Less than six percent of the participants earned a GPA below 2.50. Relatively small year-to-year fluctuations occur in the GPAs of MSAT participants.

A little less than two-thirds (64%) of the MSAT participants reported that they received training relevant to the exam at a college or university in California. Approximately 12 percent of them indicated they were prepared outside of California. For all six years, however, relatively large percentages of the participants chose not to furnish this information. Their reluctance to respond to the question may have been due to the confusing way it was stated. The question asked participants to identify both the institution where they completed coursework related to the exam and the institution they were attending when they took the MSAT. Participants who attended multiple institutions were not told which institution to report. The Commission's staff is working to clarify this question for future versions of the MSAT background information survey.

With respect to demographic characteristics, the great majority of MSAT participants (94%) indicated that English was their best language of communication (94%). More than three-fourths (78%) were females, and more than two-thirds (68%) described themselves as White. Relatively small percentages of the participants were ethnic minority group members. Mexican American, Latino, Puerto Rican, and other Hispanics made up 13 percent of all participants. Only four percent of the participants described themselves as African American and four percent as Asian American. Ethnic minority participation has increased slightly in the latest three cohorts, however.

### Passing Rates

Passing rate data are provided in Tables 7-10. [Tables 7](#) and [8](#) provide cumulative passing rates and first-time passing rates, respectively, in relation to the entire MSAT examination (both sections combined). As described in [Part 2](#) of this report, to pass the MSAT, candidates must achieve at least the passing score on each section, or achieve at least the overall passing score on the two sections combined and at least the minimum score on each section. [Table 9](#) provides both cumulative and first-time passing rates for the two sections of the MSAT separately. [Table 10](#) includes an analysis of cumulative passing rates by attempt for the two sections of the MSAT.

The cumulative passing rate table ([Table 7](#)) and the first-time passing rate table ([Table 8](#)) provide data for subgroups of participants based on preparation and demographic variables. Data are provided for the same subgroups included in the preparation and demographic data table ([Table 6](#)).

[Tables 7](#) and [8](#) provide data about cohorts of participants. As described for [Table 6](#), each participant is assigned to a cohort based on the year in which the participant initially took either section of the MSAT exam. [Tables 7](#) and [8](#) display data separately for three annual cohorts. Cumulative passing rates ([Table 7](#)) are shown for the 1997-98, 1996-97, and 1995-96 cohorts. First-time passing rates ([Table 8](#)) are presented for the 1998-99, 1997-98, and 1996-97 cohorts. [Tables 7](#) and [8](#) also contain overall passing rate data for multiple cohorts combined. [Table 7](#) shows overall cumulative passing rates for the 1992-93 through 1997-98 cohorts combined. [Table 8](#) provides overall first-time passing rates for the 1992-93 through 1998-99 cohorts combined.<sup>4</sup> [Tables 7](#) and [8](#) include data through June 1999.

<sup>4</sup>[Table 7](#) does not include cumulative passing rates for the 1998-99 cohort. Participants in that cohort have had too few opportunities to take and pass the required exam sections to make their cumulative passing rates meaningful and comparable to those of the other cohorts. Some participants in that cohort, for example, decided late in the testing year to take the test and had only one chance in the year to take one of the required sections.

Passing rates are not provided for any subgroup with less than 25 participants, because a passing rate for so few participants is too unreliable for drawing any conclusions about the subgroup.

### Cumulative Passing Rates

Cumulative passing rates reflect the fact that candidates have multiple opportunities to pass the exam. Cumulative passing rates are defined as the number of participants who have passed the examination divided by the number of participants who have taken one or both sections of the exam.

**Table 7: Cumulative Passing Rates on the MSAT**

	Overall Cumulative Passing Rates: 10/92-6/99			1997-98 Cohort Cumulative Passing Rates			1996-97 Cohort Cumulative Passing Rates			1995-96 Cohort Cumulative Passing Rates		
	N	N Passed	%	N	N Passed	%	N	N Passed	%	N	N Passed	%
All Participants	49,599	40,164	81.0	9,978	7,564	75.8	11,251	9,220	81.9	7,150	5,955	83.3
Educational Level												
Undergraduate	4,499	3,885	86.4	819	672	82.1	978	855	87.4	738	648	87.8
Bachelor's Degree	13,756	11,401	82.9	2,410	1,883	78.1	3,019	2,560	84.8	1,767	1,509	85.4
Bachelor's Degree + Units	25,040	19,698	78.7	5,439	3,962	72.8	5,842	4,588	78.5	3,789	3,073	81.1
Master's Degree and Above	5,833	4,800	82.3	1,166	936	80.3	1,376	1,186	86.2	825	698	84.6
Did Not Respond	471	380	80.7	144	111	77.1	36	31	86.1	31	27	87.1
Undergraduate College Major												
Education	11,404	8,416	73.8	2,534	1,764	69.6	2,820	2,152	76.3	1,797	1,362	75.8
English/Humanities	9,514	7,955	83.6	1,874	1,483	79.1	2,339	1,972	84.3	1,532	1,328	86.7
Math/Natural Sciences	2,428	2,183	89.9	588	509	86.6	696	632	90.8	383	358	93.5
Social Sciences	18,144	15,140	83.4	3,983	3,145	79.0	4,651	3,901	83.9	3,074	2,631	85.6
Vocational/Technical	1,453	1,089	74.9	382	242	63.4	379	290	76.5	186	144	77.4
Undecided	94	71	75.5	17	-	-	24	-	-	19	-	-
Did Not Respond	6,562	5,310	80.9	600	410	68.3	342	254	74.3	159	118	74.2
Undergraduate GPA												
From 3.5 Through 4.0	9,693	8,334	86.0	2,220	1,824	82.2	2,409	2,098	87.1	1,581	1,396	88.3
From 2.5 Through 3.49	32,127	25,648	79.8	6,851	5,133	74.9	8,077	6,594	81.6	5,076	4,197	82.7
Below 2.5	2,647	1,780	67.2	655	411	62.7	656	434	66.2	415	289	69.6
Did Not Respond	5,132	4,402	85.8	252	196	77.8	109	94	86.2	78	73	93.6
Where Prepared												
California	31,505	25,341	80.4	7,142	5,352	74.9	7,893	6,400	81.1	5,210	4,316	82.8
Outside of California	5,310	4,492	84.6	1,202	989	82.3	1,362	1,175	86.3	832	724	87.0
Did Not Respond	12,784	10,331	80.8	1,634	1,223	74.8	1,996	1,645	82.4	1,108	915	82.6

**Table 7: Cumulative Passing Rates on the MSAT**  
(continued)

	Overall Cumulative Passing Rates: 10/92 - 6/99			1997-98 Cohort Cumulative Passing Rates			1996-97 Cohort Cumulative Passing Rates			1995-96 Cohort Cumulative Passing Rates		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--	---	--	--	---	--	--

	N	N Passed	%	N	N Passed	%	N	N Passed	%	N	N Passed	%
<b>Best Language</b>												
English	47,098	38,726	82.2	9,447	7,293	77.2	10,758	8,969	83.4	6,879	5,790	84.2
Another Language	1,617	783	48.4	366	149	40.7	379	153	40.4	221	121	54.8
Did Not Respond	884	655	74.1	165	122	73.9	114	98	86.0	50	44	88.0
<b>Gender</b>												
Female	38,348	30,798	80.3	7,736	5,803	75.0	8,694	7,078	81.4	5,490	4,536	82.6
Male	11,169	9,298	83.2	2,228	1,748	78.5	2,534	2,122	83.7	1,641	1,406	85.7
Did Not Respond	82	68	82.9	14	-	-	23	-	-	19	-	-
<b>Ethnicity</b>												
African American	2,024	980	48.4	380	171	45.0	424	194	45.8	325	174	53.5
Asian American	1,986	1,620	81.6	477	370	77.6	543	440	81.0	346	300	86.7
Southeast Asian American	291	197	67.7	86	57	66.3	84	58	69.0	44	31	70.5
Pacific Islander	364	274	75.3	80	48	60.0	89	70	78.7	70	57	81.4
Mexican American	4,345	2,804	64.5	945	527	55.8	989	611	61.8	684	481	70.3
Latino or Other Hispanic	1,944	1,303	67.0	395	234	59.2	428	282	65.9	292	201	68.8
Native American, American Indian, Alaskan Native	382	300	78.5	73	49	67.1	84	64	76.2	60	49	81.7
White	34,697	29,888	86.1	6,766	5,511	81.5	7,986	6,997	87.6	4,925	4,318	87.7
Other	2,320	1,859	80.1	558	429	76.9	545	436	80.0	337	284	84.3
Did Not Respond	1,246	939	75.4	218	168	77.1	79	68	86.1	67	60	89.6

The cumulative passing rates presented in [Table 7](#) are provided for the 1992-93 through the 1997-98 cohorts combined ("Overall Cumulative Passing Rates 10/92 -- 6/98") and for each of three cohorts separately (e.g., "1996-97 Cohort Cumulative Passing Rates"). For each of these four groups, information is provided about examinees who have attempted one or both sections of the MSAT.<sup>5</sup> Three pieces of information are provided: the number of participants in the group who attempted one or both sections of the exam (N), the number of participants in the group who passed the MSAT by meeting the overall passing score for both sections and the minimum scores on each section (N Passed), and the percentage of participants in the group who passed the MSAT (% Passed).

<sup>5</sup>Overall, a total of 1,520 examinees only took one section or the other of the MSAT (not both sections) and, as a result, could not pass the MSAT. By cohort, the numbers of examinees who only attempted one section of the MSAT are: 1992-93 -- 140, 1993-94 -- 76, 1994-95 -- 60, 1995-96 -- 47, 1996-97 -- 86, 1997-98 -- 175, 1998-99 -- 936.

As shown in [Table 7](#), overall, for the 1992-93 through 1997-98 cohorts combined, more than four-fifths (81%) of the participants passed the MSAT through June 1999. Passing rates are lower for the more recent 1997-98 cohort than they are for the 1996-97 or 1995-96 cohorts. This difference may be explained both by the fact that examinees in the 1997-98 cohort have had fewer opportunities to retake the exam and by differences in first-time passing rates for these groups (which will be described later in this report).

It is difficult to evaluate the appropriateness of MSAT passing rates without considering important factors such as the academic preparation of the participants. Passing rates would be too high if under-prepared participants passed the exam, or too low if well-prepared participants did not pass it. Depending on the actual skills and knowledge of the participants, a passing rate of 70 percent, for example, may be reassuring or troubling. It is in the interest of K-12 students in California that only those MSAT participants who are competent should pass. It is extremely unlikely that all MSAT participants are well-prepared and competent, so passing rates lower than 100 percent are to be expected. Most of the following analyses consider MSAT passing rates in relation to academic preparation data that were provided by the participants themselves.

Table 7 indicates that success in passing the MSAT occurs more frequently for examinees who are well-prepared than for examinees who are less prepared. This finding provides evidence of the validity of the MSAT as a pass-fail licensure exam. Although the educational levels of participants have relatively little impact on passing rates, undergraduate major and undergraduate GPA are important factors. Overall, passing scores were earned by high percentages of participants who majored in the subjects that are included in the assessment: English/humanities (84%), mathematics/natural sciences (90%), and social sciences (83%). A smaller percentage of participants who majored in education passed (74%), perhaps because the MSAT does not assess pedagogical skill or knowledge.

Participants' academic success as undergraduate students was also strongly related to their MSAT performances. Success on the MSAT was substantially more frequent among participants whose undergraduate GPAs ranged from 3.5 through 4.0 (86%) than among others whose GPAs were below 3.5. Participants with undergraduate GPAs from 2.5 through 3.49 were significantly more likely to pass the MSAT (80%) than others whose undergraduate preparation was characterized by GPAs below 2.5 (67%). These findings also substantiate the validity of the MSAT as a licensure assessment for teachers. They suggest that passing rates for subgroups of the population may not be inappropriately low.

Table 7 also shows differences in cumulative passing rates related to the demographic characteristics of examinees. Male participants passed at a somewhat higher rate (83%) than did females (80%). Additionally, some ethnic groups passed at higher rates than other ethnic groups. Relatively high passing rates were earned by participants who described themselves as White (86%), Asian American (82%), or Native American (79%). Somewhat lower passing rates were earned by Pacific Islanders (76%), Latinos (67%), Mexican Americans (65%), Southeast Asians (68%), and African Americans (48%). Given the steps described earlier in this report that the Commission and ETS have taken to eliminate bias from the MSAT, much of the ethnic group differences in passing rates may be attributable to differences in academic preparation, including preparation variables on which data have not been collected.

First-Time Passing Rates

Table 8 shows first-time passing rates, defined as the number of participants who passed the MSAT after taking each section only once (on the same or different dates) divided by the number of participants who have attempted one or both sections. The first-time passing rates presented in Table 8 are provided for the 1992-93 through the 1998-99 cohorts combined ("Overall First-Time Passing Rates 10/92 &mdash; 6/99") and for each of three cohorts separately (e.g., "1997-98 Cohort First-Time Passing Rates"). For each of these four groups, three pieces of information are provided: the number of participants in the group who attempted one or both sections of the exam (N), the number of participants in the group who passed the MSAT after having taken each section only once (N Passed), and the percentage of participants in the group who passed the MSAT after having taken each section only once (% Passed).

Of the 66,762 participants who have attempted one or both sections of the MSAT through June 1999, 63 percent passed both sections of the exam on their first attempt. First-time passing rates have decreased over the latest four cohorts. This finding may suggest a change in the preparation of candidates who have begun attempting the MSAT. Such State initiatives as Class Size Reduction have increased the need

Table 8: First-Time Passing Rates on the MSAT

	Overall First-Time Passing Rates: 10/92 - 6/99			1998-99 Cohort First-Time Passing Rates			1997-98 Cohort First-Time Passing Rates			1996-97 Cohort First-Time Passing Rates		
	N	N Passed	%	N	N Passed	%	N	N Passed	%	N	N Passed	%
All Participants	66,762	42,122	63.1	17,163	10,172	59.3	9,978	6,474	64.9	11,251	7,388	65.7
Educational Level												
Undergraduate	6,154	4,614	75.0	1,655	1,093	66.0	819	628	76.7	978	781	79.9
Bachelor's Degree	17,959	12,400	69.0	4,203	2,554	60.8	2,410	1,708	70.9	3,019	2,186	72.4
Bachelor's Degree + Units	33,580	18,804	56.0	8,540	4,665	54.6	5,439	3,184	58.5	5,842	3,371	57.7
Master's Degree and Above	7,787	5,399	69.3	1,954	1,323	67.7	1,166	849	72.8	1,376	1,021	74.2
Did Not Respond	1,282	905	70.6	811	537	66.2	144	105	72.9	36	29	80.6

Undergraduate College Major

Education	15,066	7,873	52.3	3,662	1,950	53.2	2,534	1,413	55.8	2,820	1,564	55.5
English/Humanities	12,647	8,462	66.9	3,133	1,994	63.6	1,874	1,283	68.5	2,339	1,644	70.3
Math/Natural Sciences	3,193	2,567	80.4	765	603	78.8	588	481	81.8	696	580	83.3
Social Sciences	23,630	15,317	64.8	5,486	3,365	61.3	3,983	2,730	68.5	4,651	3,151	67.7
Vocational/Technical	3,203	1,756	54.8	1,750	956	54.6	382	178	46.6	379	221	58.3
Undecided	134	69	51.5	40	17	42.5	17	-	-	24	-	-
Did Not Respond	8,889	6,078	68.4	2,327	1,287	55.3	600	380	63.3	342	215	62.9

Undergraduate GPA

From 3.5 Through 4.0	13,582	9,714	71.5	3,889	2,732	70.2	2,220	1,654	74.5	2,409	1,781	73.9
From 2.5 Through 3.49	43,337	26,029	60.1	11,210	6,335	56.5	6,851	4,300	62.8	8,077	5,223	64.7
Below 2.5	3,626	1,632	45.0	979	384	39.2	655	335	51.1	656	298	45.4
Did Not Respond	6,217	4,747	76.4	1,085	721	66.5	252	185	73.4	109	86	78.9

Where Prepared

California	42,421	25,335	59.7	10,916	6,263	57.4	7,142	4,451	62.3	7,893	4,914	62.3
Outside of California	7,905	5,542	70.1	2,595	1,804	69.5	1,202	899	74.8	1,362	999	73.3
Did Not Respond	16,436	11,245	68.4	3,652	2,105	57.6	1,634	1,124	68.8	1,996	1,475	73.9

Table 8: First-Time Passing Rates on the MSAT  
(continued)

	Overall First-Time Passing Rates: 10/92 - 6/99			1998-99 Cohort First-Time Passing Rates			1997-98 Cohort First-Time Passing Rates			1996-97 Cohort First-Time Passing Rates		
	N	N Passed	%	N	N Passed	%	N	N Passed	%	N	N Passed	%
Best Language												
English	62,779	40,546	64.6	15,681	9,475	60.4	9,447	6,262	66.3	10,758	7,227	67.2
Another Language	2,230	512	23.0	613	131	21.4	366	97	26.5	379	68	17.9
Did Not Respond	1,753	1,064	60.7	869	566	65.1	165	115	69.7	114	93	81.6
Gender												
Female	51,759	31,844	61.5	13,411	7,780	58.0	7,736	4,911	63.5	8,694	5,614	64.6
Male	14,866	10,186	68.5	3,697	2,357	63.8	2,228	1,551	69.6	2,534	1,755	69.3
Did Not Respond	137	92	67.2	55	35	63.6	14	-	-	23	-	-



Ethnicity												
African American	2,828	719	25.4	804	185	23.0	380	109	28.7	424	100	23.6
Asian American	2,792	1,692	60.6	806	470	58.3	477	314	65.8	543	338	62.2
Southeast Asian American	470	191	40.6	179	69	38.5	86	46	53.5	84	35	41.7
Pacific Islander	531	282	53.1	167	76	45.5	80	40	50.0	89	59	66.3
Mexican American	6,182	2,422	39.2	1,837	658	35.8	945	378	40.0	989	371	37.5
Latino or Other Hispanic	2,673	1,113	41.6	729	275	37.7	395	174	44.1	428	172	40.2
Native American, American Indian, Alaskan Native	502	311	62.0	120	63	52.5	73	44	60.3	84	51	60.7
White	45,293	31,954	70.5	10,596	7,131	67.3	6,766	4,846	71.6	7,986	5,863	73.4
Other	3,205	2,003	62.5	885	535	60.5	558	364	65.2	545	336	61.7
Did Not Respond	2,286	1,435	62.8	1,040	710	68.3	218	159	72.9	79	63	79.7

for elementary teachers over the last several years. As a result, less qualified candidates may be filling positions (e.g., on Emergency Permits) and attempting to pass the MSAT. The increasing numbers of candidates in these most recent cohorts is consistent with this explanation of changes in first-time passing rates over time, as is the similar pattern of cumulative passing rates. The demographic and preparation data reported by examinees have not differed significantly across the three cohorts, however. Undergraduate major and GPA may not be sensitive enough measures of preparation to reflect a difference of this nature. Other unmeasured differences in preparation may account for the difference in passing rates.

Generally, the same patterns in passing rates among subgroups of participants noted above with respect to the cumulative passing rates exist with respect to first-time passing rates. First-time passing rates for participants who completed undergraduate majors in mathematics or natural science were considerably higher than for those who completed any other undergraduate major. This difference shrinks, however, as candidates have opportunities to complete additional preparation and retake the examination, as evidenced in the difference between first-time and cumulative passing rates.

### Cumulative and First-Time Passing Rates for Each Section of the MSAT

Table 9 shows both cumulative and first-time passing rates for the two sections of the MSAT separately. The cumulative passing rates in Table 9 are defined as the number of participants who passed the MSAT section between October 1992 and June 1999 (regardless of the number of attempts) divided by the number of participants who initially attempted the section of the MSAT between October 1992 and June 1998. The first-time passing rates in these tables are defined as the number of participants who passed who passed the MSAT section between October 1992 and June 1999 on their first attempt divided by the number of participants who initially attempted that section during that time period. In Table 9, passing a section of the MSAT means meeting or exceeding the passing score, not the minimum score (see Table 5).

Table 9: Cumulative and First-Time Passing Rates on the MSAT (By Section)

MSAT Section	Cumulative Passing Rates			First-Time Passing Rates		
	N	Passed		N	Passed	
		N	%		N	%
MSAT Content Knowledge	49469	38668	78.2	66303	45258	68.3
MSAT Content Area Exercises	49018	35873	73.2	65701	40463	61.6

Cumulatively, a slightly higher percentage of participants passed the Content Knowledge section of the MSAT (78%) than passed the Content Area Exercises (73%). First-time passing rates for the two sections of the exam were 68 percent for the



Table 10 shows an analysis of cumulative passing rates for each of the two sections of the MSAT. For each attempt by examinees (e.g., first, second), Table 10 displays the number of participants, the number of those who participated in that attempt who passed, the percentage who passed on that attempt, the number of participants who did not pass and did not make further attempts, and the cumulative passing rate after that attempt. For example, the second row under MSAT Content Knowledge reveals that, of the 10,021 examinees who attempted the exam at least twice, 2,912 (29%) passed on that second attempt, 2,353 gave up and stopped taking the exam, and 4,756 attempted the exam a third time. Fourth and greater attempts are not represented in Table 10.

Table 10: Analysis of Cumulative Passing Rates on the MSAT (By Section)

MSAT Section	N	N Passed	% Passed	No More Attempts	Cum. % Passing
<b>MSAT Content Knowledge</b>					
First Attempt	49469	33874	68.5	5574	68.5
Second Attempt	10021	2912	29.1	2353	74.4
Third Attempt	4756	1011	21.3	1250	76.4
<b>MSAT Content Area Exercises</b>					
First Attempt	49018	30763	62.8	8151	62.8
Second Attempt	10104	3424	33.9	2667	69.7
Third Attempt	4013	1062	26.5	1206	71.9

The data in Table 10 confirm that first-time success rates are greater than success rates for repeaters. First, second, and third attempts account for a significant amount of the overall cumulative passing rate on each section of the MSAT. An examinee's chance of passing each section decreases with each unsuccessful attempt, probably because at least some of these examinees do not complete additional preparation. Table 10 also shows that many examinees drop out after one or two unsuccessful attempts and give up trying to pass the MSAT. Although approximately the same numbers of examinees take the two sections of the exam, examinees are more likely to stop trying after failed attempts on the MSAT Content Area Exercises than on the MSAT Content Knowledge section (12,024 compared to 9,177 after up to three attempts).

Appendix A:  
MSAT Specifications

THE PRAXIS SERIES:  
PROFESSIONAL ASSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS®

TEST SPECIFICATIONS

<b>MULTIPLE SUBJECTS ASSESSMENT FOR TEACHERS</b>
<b>TEST</b> Knowledge: 0140 Content Area Exercises: 0151
<b>NUMBER/TYPE OF QUESTION</b> Content Knowledge: 120 Multiple-Choice Questions Content Area Exercises: 18 Short Constructed-Response Questions
<b>TIME</b> Content Knowledge: 2 hours Content Area Exercises: 3 hours
<b>CONTENTS</b>  LITERATURE AND LANGUAGE STUDIES MATHEMATICS VISUAL AND PERFORMING ARTS PHYSICAL EDUCATION HUMAN DEVELOPMENT HISTORY-SOCIAL STUDIES SCIENCE

The Multiple Subjects Assessment for Teachers focuses on the seven subject areas that are considered central to elementary education. The tests measure knowledge of literature and language studies, mathematics, visual and performing arts, physical education, human development, history-social studies, and science.

The subjects are covered by two types of tests administered in a total of five hours of testing time. The first two-hour test, Content Knowledge, is a standard multiple-choice test of 120 questions. The seven subject areas are covered in blocks of questions about a given subject.

The second test, Content Area Exercises, requires examinees to write short responses (approximately ten minutes each) to questions in the response book. These questions are also arranged in blocks by subject. Content Area Exercises contains 18 short constructed-response (essay) questions that are administered over a 3 hour period with one 5-minute stretch break.

A description of the test specifications for each of the seven subject areas appears in the following pages.

Copyright© 1995. Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.

**THE PRAXIS SERIES:  
PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS®**

**TEST SPECIFICATIONS**

<b>MULTIPLE SUBJECTS ASSESSMENT FOR TEACHERS</b> HISTORY-SOCIAL STUDIES
22 Multiple-Choice Questions 3 Constructed-Response Questions
<b>TEST DESCRIPTION</b>  The History-Social Studies component of the Multiple Subjects Assessment for Teachers focuses on essential understandings of important historical events and issues and basic social concepts. Because history and social studies are best seen as mutually enriching, most of the questions, whether multiple-choice or constructed-response, will require knowledge of both history and social studies. Similarly, because critical thinking skills are integral to essential understandings, many of the questions require the exercise of such skills. In many instances, especially in the constructed-response section, examinees are asked to utilize these skills in demonstrating an understanding of original documents, such as charts, graphs, cartoons, and short quotations. Most of the United States History and World History questions in the Content Knowledge section will also require knowledge of one or more of the following social studies fields: Government and Politics, Geography, Economics, Anthropology and Sociology.
<b>CONTENTS</b> United States History World History Nonhistorical Social Studies

Copyright© 1994. Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.

**CONTENT DESCRIPTION**

**HISTORICAL FIELDS**

**I. United States History (50%)**

**A. Native American Civilizations**

- Demonstrate knowledge of Native American peoples in various regions, including migration patterns
- Demonstrate knowledge of the political, economic, social, and cultural life of Native American peoples
- Demonstrate understanding of interactions between Native Americans and other peoples

B. European Exploration and Colonization· Demonstrate understanding of the causes and purposes of European exploration and colonization

- Demonstrate knowledge of colonial cultures and societies, including their religions
- Demonstrate knowledge of colonial political institutions
- Demonstrate knowledge of colonial economic institutions

C. The American Revolution and the Founding of the Nation

- Demonstrate understanding of the causes and results of the American Revolution
- Demonstrate knowledge of the drafting of the Constitution, including debates and compromises
- Demonstrate knowledge of the Bill of Rights and of the ratification of the Constitution
- Demonstrate knowledge of the organization and structure of United States government

D. Growth of the New Republic

- Demonstrate knowledge of Westward expansion
- Demonstrate knowledge of Jacksonian democracy
- Demonstrate understanding of sectionalism

E. The Civil War and Reconstruction

- Demonstrate understanding of the causes and consequences of the Civil War and Reconstruction

F. The Industrialization of America

- Demonstrate knowledge of technological and agricultural innovations during this period
- Demonstrate knowledge of business and labor during this period
- Demonstrate knowledge of immigration to the United States and of urbanization during this period
- Demonstrate knowledge of American imperialism during this period
- Demonstrate knowledge of political, cultural, and social movements during this period

G. The First World War

- Demonstrate understanding of the causes and consequences of the Civil War and Reconstruction

H. Post-World War I America

- Demonstrate knowledge of changes in American society after the First World War
- Demonstrate understanding of the causes and effects of the Depression

I. The Second World War

- Demonstrate understanding of the causes and consequences of the Second World War

J. Post-World War II American Society

- Demonstrate understanding of Cold War developments
- Demonstrate knowledge of social movements, including the civil rights movement and the women's movement
- Demonstrate understanding of the rise of the consumer society after the Second World War
- Demonstrate understanding of changes in the United States economic structure after the Second World War
- Demonstrate knowledge of governmental reforms and domestic concerns since the Second World War
- Demonstrate understanding of the growth of environmentalism and conservationism since the Second World War
- Demonstrate understanding of the changing role of the United States in world affairs since the Second World War

## **II. World History (45%)**

A. Prehistory and the Development of Early Civilizations

- Demonstrate knowledge of prehistory and of the development of early civilizations

## B. Classical Civilizations

- Demonstrate knowledge of classical civilizations (for example, Greece and Rome)

## C. Feudalism in Japan and Europe

- Demonstrate knowledge of feudalism in Japan and Europe

## D. Chinese and Indian Empires

- Demonstrate knowledge of Chinese and Indian empires

## E. Sub-Saharan Kingdoms and Cultures

- Demonstrate knowledge of sub-Saharan kingdoms and cultures

## F. Islamic Civilization

- Demonstrate knowledge of Islamic civilization

## G. Civilizations of the Americas

- Demonstrate knowledge of the civilizations of the Americas prior to the arrival of Europeans

## H. Rise and Expansion of Europe

- Demonstrate knowledge of the transition to a market economy in Europe
- Demonstrate knowledge of navigational and technological innovations in Europe
- Demonstrate understanding of the patterns of cultural contact between European and other peoples

## I. European Developments

- Demonstrate knowledge of the Renaissance
- Demonstrate knowledge of the Reformation
- Demonstrate knowledge of the scientific revolution
- Demonstrate knowledge of the Enlightenment
- Demonstrate knowledge of the Industrial Revolution

## J. Nationalism and Imperialism

- Demonstrate knowledge of the causes and consequences of nationalism and imperialism

## K. Twentieth-Century Ideologies and Conflicts

- Demonstrate understanding of the causes and consequences of the First World War
- Demonstrate knowledge of twentieth-century revolutions
- Demonstrate knowledge of the worldwide economic depression
- Demonstrate knowledge of the rise of communism and fascism
- Demonstrate knowledge of the spread of the Industrial Revolution
- Demonstrate knowledge of the Cold War
- Demonstrate knowledge of the end of colonial empires

## **SOCIAL STUDIES FIELDS (5%)**

### **I. Government and Politics**

#### A. Political Concepts and Theories

- Demonstrate understanding of fundamental political concepts
- Demonstrate understanding of the need for government (for example, conflict resolution, collective decision-making)
- Demonstrate knowledge of political philosophies

## B. United States Political System

- Demonstrate understanding of the Constitutional foundation of the United States government (limited government, separation of powers, federalism, republicanism)
- Demonstrate understanding of political institutions
- Demonstrate understanding of state and local government
- Demonstrate understanding of the rights and responsibilities of citizens

## II. Geography

### A. Map and Globe Skills

- Demonstrate map and globe skills

### B. Physical Geography

- Demonstrate knowledge of physical geography

### C. Cultural Geography

- Demonstrate knowledge of geographic population patterns
- Demonstrate knowledge of the geographic distribution of races
- Demonstrate knowledge of the geographic distribution of languages
- Demonstrate knowledge of the geographic distribution of religions
- Demonstrate knowledge of geographic migration patterns

### D. Political Geography

- Demonstrate knowledge of regional boundaries
- Demonstrate knowledge of strategic points
- Demonstrate understanding of geopolitical hegemony

### E. Economic Geography

- Demonstrate understanding of geographic aspects of production
- Demonstrate understanding of geographic aspects of processing
- Demonstrate understanding of geographic aspects of marketing
- Demonstrate understanding of transportation

### F. Regional Geography

- Demonstrate understanding of regional geography

## III. Economics

### A. Basic Economic Concepts

- Demonstrate understanding of scarcity and choice
- Demonstrate understanding of productive resources including, land, labor, capital, entrepreneurship
- Demonstrate understanding of opportunity costs and tradeoffs
- Demonstrate understanding of supply and demand
- Demonstrate understanding of comparative and absolute advantage
- Demonstrate understanding of comparative economic systems

### B. Government's Role in the Economy

- Demonstrate understanding of monetary policy and interest rates
- Demonstrate understanding of fiscal policy, taxes, and government spending

## IV. Anthropology and Sociology

### A. Definitions and Methods

- Demonstrate ability to define key terms and to understand research methods and techniques of study

## B. Human Culture and Social Organization

- Demonstrate understanding of role, enculturation, and socialization
- Demonstrate understanding of kinship patterns
- Demonstrate understanding of social institutions (family, religion, government)
- Demonstrate understanding of social stratification (caste, class)
- Demonstrate knowledge of subcultures within a dominant culture
- Demonstrate understanding of multicultural diversity, including race, religion, ethnicity, discrimination, and prejudice
- Demonstrate understanding of the role of language and other forms of communication

## C. How Cultures Change

- Demonstrate understanding of cultural intervention
- Demonstrate understanding of cultural innovation
- Demonstrate understanding of cultural diffusion
- Demonstrate understanding of cultural adaptation
- Demonstrate understanding of cultural assimilation
- Demonstrate understanding of cultural extinction

Copyright© 1994. Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.

### Specifications for the Content Area Exercises section (History-Social Studies Short Constructed-Response)

The three short constructed-response questions in history-social studies are designed to test knowledge of history and the social studies and the abilities to define and clarify issues, judge information, and draw conclusions.

In most cases, questions ask examinees to utilize these abilities in demonstrating an understanding of stimulus material such as maps, graphs, cartoons or short quotations.

Each of the three questions will have both history and social studies content. Questions will be allocated in one of the following manners:

#### EITHER:

United States History/Political Science	1 question
United States History/Geography	1 question
World History/Economics	1 question

#### OR:

United States History/Political Science	1 question
United States History/Economics	1 question
World History/Geography	1 question

## THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS®

### TEST SPECIFICATIONS

#### MULTIPLE SUBJECTS ASSESSMENT FOR TEACHERS HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

8 Multiple-Choice Questions  
2 Constructed-Response Questions

#### TEST DESCRIPTION

The Human Development component of the Multiple Subjects Assessment for Teachers focuses on the basic knowledge and skills needed by beginning teachers to best respond to their students, rather than on the subject matter that teachers actually teach. Understanding the basic theories of human development, research in the subject, and major developmental perspectives are part of the basic knowledge that individuals must bring to the teaching profession. Such understandings

help teachers interpret student behavior, plan instruction to meet student needs, and nurture students' affective development.

The Human Development component also assesses the examinees' knowledge about, and skills for gathering and using information about students. Such knowledge includes awareness of issues related to such things as confidentiality and the appropriate use of information for placement and other situations. With the growing diversity of the nation's school population, teachers should be even more aware of the effects their attitudes may have on children. This requires greater sensitivity to ethnic, gender, and linguistic diversity and understanding of the individual differences that children bring to their learning environments.

An average of one-fourth of the test questions across forms in the component will be concerned with Perspectives on Diversity. These perspectives will reflect the other content areas, such as Theory, Research, Major Developmental Perspectives and Gathering Information, as they pertain to diverse populations. Questions will be randomly sampled from each subcategory within categories to assure equal probability of representation in the component. For example, one test edition may have one question each on social learning and cognitive development, while another may have one question each on social learning and psychosocial development.

### **CONTENTS**

Implication and Applications of Theory  
Implications and Applications of Research  
Major Developmental Perspectives  
Gathering and Using Information  
Perspectives on Diversity

*Copyright© 1994. Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.*

### **CONTENT DESCRIPTION**

#### **I. Implications and Applications of Theory (20%)**

##### **A. Behavioral Development**

- Demonstrate understanding of implications and applications of theories of behavioral development

##### **B. Cognitive Development**

- Demonstrate understanding of implications and applications of theories of cognitive development

##### **C. Social Learning**

- Demonstrate understanding of implications and applications of theories of social learning

##### **D. Psychosocial Development**

- Demonstrate understanding of implications and applications of theories of psychosocial development

#### **II. Implications and Applications of Research (30%)**

##### **A. Family Influences and Attachment**

- Demonstrate understanding of implications and applications of research on family influences and attachment

##### **B. Personality and Temperament**

- Demonstrate understanding of implications and applications of research on personality and temperament

##### **C. Factors Affecting Achievement**

- Demonstrate understanding of implications and applications of research on factors affecting achievement

##### **D. Aggression and Prosocial Behavior**

- Demonstrate understanding of implications and applications of research on aggression and prosocial behavior

#### E. Intelligence and Intellectual Development

- Demonstrate understanding of implications and applications of research on intelligence and intellectual development

#### F. Play

- Demonstrate understanding of implications and applications of research on play

#### G. Moral Development and Character Education

- Demonstrate understanding of implications and applications of research on moral development and character education

#### H. Effects of Substance Abuse on the Unborn Child

- Demonstrate understanding of implications and applications of research on the effects of substance abuse on the unborn child

### III. Major Developmental Perspectives (15%)

#### A. Continuity vs. Discontinuity

- Demonstrate understanding of theories or research concerning the continuous nature of human development
- Demonstrate understanding of theories or research concerning the discontinuous or stagelike nature of human development
- Demonstrate understanding of the differences between continuous and discontinuous perspectives of human development

#### B. Nature vs. Nurture

- Demonstrate understanding of theories or research concerning the influences of biological predispositions on human development
- Demonstrate understanding of theories or research concerning environmental influences on human development
- Demonstrate understanding of theories or research concerning the relative importance of biological predispositions and environmental factors as influences on human development

#### C. Child-Centered vs. Adult-Directed Learning

- Demonstrate understanding of theories or research that focus primarily on children as active agents in their own learning
- Demonstrate understanding of theories or research that focus primarily on children's learning directed by adults
- Demonstrate understanding of the differences in child-centered and adult-directed perspectives of children's learning

### IV. Gathering and Using Information (10%)

#### A. Formal and Informal Methods of Assessing Children

- Demonstrate understanding of formal methods of assessing children
- Demonstrate understanding of informal methods of assessing children
- Demonstrate understanding of the relative strengths and weaknesses of different types of formal and informal methods of assessing children

#### B. Ethical Issues

- Demonstrate understanding of ethical issues related to gathering and using information about children

### V. Perspectives on Diversity (25%)

#### A. Human Diversity



- Demonstrate understanding of how human development is influenced by differences among different populations or groups of people

Specifications for Content Area Exercises Section  
(Human Development Short-Constructed Response)

The purpose of Content Area Exercises section is to test breadth of thinking skills and knowledge in the seven content areas of the Assessment at a level that corresponds to lower-division coursework in subject matter preparation programs for beginning teachers. Two short constructed-response questions have been allocated to human development. One will be designed to provide examinees the opportunity to demonstrate their understanding of significant developmental theories and research. The other will specifically assess, in terms of perspectives on diversity, understanding of the following: significant developmental theory, research, gathering and using information, or major perspectives.

**THE PRAXIS SERIES:  
PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS®**

**TEST SPECIFICATIONS**

**MULTIPLE SUBJECTS ASSESSMENT FOR TEACHERS  
LITERATURE AND LANGUAGE STUDIES**

24 Multiple-Choice Questions  
3 Constructed-Response Questions

**TEST DESCRIPTION**

The Literature and Language Studies component of the Multiple Subjects Assessment for Teachers focuses on literature, linguistics and language, and communication skills. This component will also measure examinees' ability to communicate understandings about these areas in writing and to apply principles related to the language arts to diverse topics.

The term "literature" refers to both expository and narrative writing and to the written documents of all disciplines. Knowledge of literature should reflect a multi-cultural perspective and should include knowledge of written works that are relevant to women and to people from diverse ethnic groups. Questions assessing knowledge of literature will not require identification of specific authors or literary works; however, they will include references to key authors and pieces of Western and Nonwestern literature. Questions assessing language and linguistics and communication skills require examinees to demonstrate knowledge about the content, display their ability to think critically about relevant problems, and apply their knowledge in appropriate situations.

**CONTENTS**

Literature  
Language and Linguistics  
Oral and Written Communication

*Copyright© 1994. Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.*

**CONTENT DESCRIPTION**

**I. Literature (35%)**

**A. Literary Concepts, Conventions, and Terminology**

- Demonstrate understanding of narrative, including plot, theme, characterization, and setting
- Demonstrate understanding of imagery, theme, figurative language, and irony
- Demonstrate understanding of satire, comedy, tragedy, romance, and other genres
- Demonstrate understanding of tone and attitude
- Demonstrate understanding of author's point of view and assumptions

**B. Assumptions and Conventions of Primary Literary Genres (Including Children's Literature)**

- Demonstrate understanding of the genres of poetry, fiction, and nonfiction
- Demonstrate understanding of genre of visual/verbal works, including cartoons, advertisements, film, video,

and propaganda

C. Social/Historical Contexts As They Relate to Literature

- Demonstrate understanding of historical influences
- Demonstrate understanding of social influences
- Demonstrate understanding of cultural influences
- Demonstrate understanding of the implications of audience
- Demonstrate understanding of similarities and differences among works from different cultural traditions and historic periods

D. Approaches to Reading and Interpreting Literature

- Demonstrate understanding of the various ways that readers engage with written works
- Demonstrate understanding of the role of prior knowledge and experiences in understanding text

**II. Language and Linguistics (30%)**

A. Language Development

- Demonstrate understanding of the basic stages of language development, including factors that enhance or inhibit this development

B. Standard American English

- Demonstrate understanding of historical and cultural influences on the evolution of standard American English

C. Principles of Linguistics in Analyzing Various Textual Contexts

- Demonstrate understanding of language sounds and their distribution, syntax, semantics, word formation, conventions of language, and geographic and social variations

D. Integration of Language Across Disciplines

- Demonstrate understanding of the interrelatedness of speaking, listening, reading, and writing
- Demonstrate understanding of language as evidenced in all disciplines

**III. Oral and Written Communication (35%)**

A. Analyzing Written Text and Understanding the Production of Text

- Demonstrate understanding of aspects of composition, including prewriting, organizing, drafting, revising, and editing material
- Demonstrate understanding of writing to an audience
- Demonstrate understanding of writing for a purpose

B. Analyzing Oral Discourse and Understanding Its Applications

- Demonstrate understanding of informal oral discourse
- Demonstrate understanding of formal oral discourse

C. Rhetorical Conventions

- Demonstrate understanding of narration, exposition, reflection, and argumentation

D. Diverse Research Strategies

- Demonstrate knowledge of print and nonprint sources for locating information
- Demonstrate ability to interpret the written reports of research
- Demonstrate ability to interpret pictorial materials

Specifications for the Content Area Exercises Section  
(Literature and Language Studies Short Constructed-Response)

The purpose of the Content Area Exercises section is to test breadth of thinking skills and knowledge in the seven content areas of the Assessment at a level that corresponds to lower-division course work in subject matter preparation programs for beginning elementary and secondary school teachers. The three short constructed-response questions that have been allocated to literature and language studies are designed to give examinees the opportunity to do the following:

- demonstrate their ability to think critically about relevant topics in the discipline
- apply knowledge of the discipline appropriately in discussing relevant issues, topics, and ideas
- communicate effectively in writing about relevant topics in the discipline
- analyze and evaluate excerpts from literature

The three questions will be allocated to the major content categories as follows:

Literature (1 question)

Language and Linguistics (1 question)

Oral and Written Communication (1 question)

**THE PRAXIS SERIES:  
PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS®**

**TEST SPECIFICATIONS**

<b>MULTIPLE SUBJECTS ASSESSMENT FOR TEACHERS MATHEMATICS</b>
24 Multiple-Choice Questions 3 Constructed-Response Questions
<b>TEST DESCRIPTION</b>
<b>CONTENTS</b>

The Mathematics component of the Multiple Subjects Assessment for Teachers focuses on mathematical understandings, the ability to communicate these understandings verbally and symbolically, and the ability to solve problems that require that application of mathematics. Estimation, logic, and problem solving are subsumed in every category.

Because the emphasis is on assessing examinees' ability to reason logically, to use mathematical techniques in problem-solving, and to communicate mathematical ideas effectively, the examinees will be allowed to use a basic four-function calculator.

The Mathematics component does not require knowledge of mathematics that goes beyond secondary level, but may require examinees to relate mathematics to real-life situations. Mathematics is conceptualized as an integrated field; therefore, a single problem may test several mathematical content areas.

Number Sense and Numeration  
Geometry  
Measurement  
Algebraic Concepts  
Number Theory  
The Real Number System and Its Subsystems  
Probability and Statistics

*Copyright© 1994. Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.*

**CONTENT DESCRIPTION**

**I. Number Sense and Numeration (20%)**

**A. Fundamental Concepts**

- Demonstrate understanding of the meaning and implications of number and numeration concepts as they

relate to problem solving, using cardinal and ordinal numbers, place value, ordering of fractions, decimals, and whole numbers

## **II. Geometry (20%)**

### **A. Relationships**

- Demonstrate knowledge of relationships in two and three dimensions and ability to draw inferences based on precepts/concepts of parallelism, perpendicularity, congruence and similarity, angle measurements of polygons, and decomposition (part/whole relationships)

### **B. Basic Properties**

- Demonstrate understanding of properties of figures and shapes (for example, conservation of size and shape through geometric transformation, such as rotation, flip, reflection, and translation)

## **III. Measurement (5%)**

### **A. Units of Measure**

- Demonstrate knowledge and application of standard units of both the metric and English systems and of nonstandard units (for example, paper clips, erasers and body measures) in measuring length, perimeter, area, capacity, volume, mass, weight, angle, time, and temperature

## **IV. Algebraic Concepts (10%)**

### **A. Properties**

- Demonstrate ability to recognize and apply algebraic concepts such as the associative, commutative, and distributive properties, the additive and multiplicative identities and inverses, the special properties of zero and one, equalities and inequalities

### **B. Patterns**

- Demonstrate ability to describe patterns by writing or identifying a formula, (for example, given a series of numbers, the examinee writes or identifies the algebraic formula that describes the relationship shown)

## **V. Number Theory (10%)**

### **A. Fundamental Concepts**

- Demonstrate understanding of prime and composite numbers (emphasis on relationships), relatively prime numbers, and the relationship to fractions (renaming)
- Demonstrate understanding of divisibility rules
- Demonstrate understanding of least common multiple, including set theory
- Demonstrate understanding of greatest common divisor, including set theory

## **VI. The Real Number System and Its Subsystems (20%)**

### **A. Problem Solving**

- Solve real-world situational problems involving whole numbers, fractions (including decimals), integers, ratios and proportions, and percentages
- Demonstrate knowledge of how both the standard and alternate algorithms work for the four basic operations for whole numbers, integers, positive and negative rational numbers (including decimal notation), and real numbers

## **VII. Probability and Statistics (15%)**

### **A. Probability**

- Solve basic problems involving probability and make predictions using relative frequency experiments, methods of counting, sample spaces, joint events, independent events, and simulation techniques

### **B. Tables and Graphs**

- Demonstrate understanding of organization and presentation of data through tables and graphs, understand scales and possible bias in graphs, and interpret measures of central tendency and dispersion

### C. Statistics

- Demonstrate ability to recognize valid and invalid inferences based on statistical data

#### Specifications for the Content Area Exercises Section (Mathematics Short Constructed-Response)

The purpose of the Content Area Exercises section is to test breadth of thinking skills and knowledge in the seven content areas of the Assessment at a level that corresponds to lower-division coursework in subject matter preparation programs for beginning elementary and secondary school teachers. The three short constructed-response questions allocated to mathematics are designed to test the following abilities:

- To represent and summarize data
- To develop and illustrate strategies for solving more complex problems
- To communicate mathematical ideas effectively
- To make generalizations

The three short constructed-response questions will be allocated to the major content categories as follows:

- Number Sense and Numeration, Algebraic Concepts, Number Theory and the Real Number System and Its Subsystems (1 question) Questions in this category would focus on the understanding of real numbers and their relationships.
- Geometry and Measurement (1 question)

A measurement question in this category would serve as a subcategory of a question with a geometry focus.

- The Real Number System and its Subsystems and Probability and Statistics (1 question)

A question classified under the Real Number System in this category would have an applied emphasis rather than a pure emphasis.

Any question may involve concepts from more than one area of mathematics.

Copyright© 1994. Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.

## THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS®

### TEST SPECIFICATIONS

#### MULTIPLE SUBJECTS ASSESSMENT FOR TEACHERS PHYSICAL EDUCATION

8 Multiple-Choice Questions  
2 Constructed-Response Questions

#### TEST DESCRIPTION

The Physical Education component of the Multiple Subjects Assessment for Teachers focuses on the two types of knowledge needed to successfully teach this subject. Questions assess whether the examinee has a sufficiently broad knowledge of the three major classes of activities that comprise the content of physical education classes. In the outline presented below, category I, Movement Concepts and Forms covers these three classes of activities.

In addition, the questions assess whether the examinee has the required knowledge of several areas of the physical sciences and social sciences. These areas are represented by categories II and III of the content outline. The term "foundations" in the title of each of these categories indicates the way in which knowledge of these topics is related to the teacher's knowledge of category I. Knowledge of the foundations enables teachers to understand the nature and purpose of the activities in the physical education curriculum, to evaluate and interpret the physical characteristics and performances of students in physical education classes, and to make decisions about the ongoing conduct of physical education classes and the needs of students in those classes.

Multiple-choice questions in this component assess the examinee's knowledge of basic principles in each of the three major categories. The constructed-response questions in the Content Area Exercises section assess the examinee's ability to select activities for particular purposes, make decisions about the status and needs of students, and provide explanations drawn from the foundations topics for these selections and decisions.

## CONTENTS

Movement Concepts and Forms  
Physical and Biological Science Foundations  
Social Science Foundations

Copyright© 1994. Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.

## CONTENT DESCRIPTION

### I. Movement Concepts and Forms (50%)

#### A. Fundamental Movements/Movement Concepts

- Demonstrate knowledge of locomotor, nonlocomotor, and manipulative movements
- Demonstrate understanding of fundamental movement concepts, including space, effort/quality, and relationships

#### B. Fitness

- Demonstrate knowledge of skill-related and health-related fitness, and conditioning

#### C. Movement Forms

- Demonstrate knowledge of nontraditional games and sports, traditional/individual/dual/team games and sports, tumbling, and gymnastics

### II. Physical and Biological Science Foundations (40%)

#### A. Growth and Development/Motor Learning

- Demonstrate knowledge of growth and development concepts (for example, characteristics of sensory-perceptual development, individual variation)
- Demonstrate knowledge of motor learning, including information processing, attention, and types of feedback

#### B. Scientific Aspects

- Demonstrate knowledge of anatomy
- Demonstrate knowledge of exercise physiology, physiology, and health, including fitness testing, drug use, and nutrition
- Demonstrate knowledge of kinesiology, including mechanical principles, warmup, and injury prevention

### III. Social Science Foundations (10%)

#### A. Social/Psychological Aspects

- Demonstrate knowledge of social and psychological aspects of individual and group movement

## Specifications for the Content Area Exercises Section (Physical Education Short Constructed-Response)

The purpose of the Content Area Exercises section is to test breadth of thinking skills and knowledge in the seven content areas of the Assessment at a level that corresponds to lower-division coursework in subject matter preparation programs for beginning teachers. Each of the two questions in this section will require the examinee to demonstrate one or more of the following:

- the ability to describe characteristics of movement forms

- the ability to design/prescribe movement routines to achieve specific goals and/or to meet the needs of specified groups of children and young adults
- the ability to assess/diagnose status of students based on an appropriate combination of verbal and quantitative information

Questions in this section will not require that the examinee further demonstrate an ability to explain or justify such responses with information drawn from categories II or III of the content outline. However, the examinee will be encouraged to include any such amplification that is appropriate to the question.

In each edition of the Assessment, one question in the Content Area Exercises section will deal with fitness. The other question will deal with a topic from the Fundamental Movements or Movement Forms category.

**THE PRAXIS SERIES:  
ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS®**

**TEST SPECIFICATIONS**

<p><b>MULTIPLE SUBJECTS ASSESSMENT FOR TEACHERS</b> <b>SCIENCE</b></p>
<p>22 Multiple-Choice Questions 3 Constructed-Response Questions</p>
<p><b>TEST DESCRIPTION</b></p> <p>The Science component of the Multiple Subjects Assessment for Teachers focuses on the examinees' understanding of fundamental scientific concepts, principles, and interrelationships within the context of real-world, meaningful science phenomena, problems, and issues.</p> <p>To be effective in the classroom, teachers must be able to help students develop an understanding of the nature of science as a complex human enterprise with a distinct philosophy and methodology. To achieve this, they must be able not only to demonstrate an understanding of scientific concepts but also to apply those concepts, identify problems, formulate and test hypotheses, design experiments, analyze and evaluate data, use both theoretical and practical models, and use instruments. The questions in the component are designed to assess these abilities. Science is also viewed as an integrated field; therefore, a single question may assess understanding of several content areas.</p> <p>The emphasis is process oriented, presented within human contexts, and related to real-life applications. At least one-third of the questions are process oriented and relate to: the application and evaluation of scientific methods and processes; the application of mathematics, measurement, and data organization to science. At least one-tenth of the questions relate to the impact of science and technology on the environment and human affairs (for example, issues including ethical issues associated with production and use of energy, consumer products, and foods; conservation of resources; biotechnology; health; atmospheric breakdown; and global warming.) To the extent possible, the component presents science as a human endeavor and makes reference to the contribution of individuals and cultures to the field of science.</p> <p>At least one question will be asked from each area that is marked with an asterisk. To the extent possible the questions aim to address concepts, generalizations, and "big ideas." The vocabulary/terminology is given in scientific terms, (for example, prokaryotic, lipid, kinetic theory) will be translated into simple English terminology.</p>
<p><b>CONTENTS</b></p> <p>Biology Geosciences Physical Sciences</p>

Copyright© 1994. Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.

**CONTENT DESCRIPTION**

**I. Biology (33%)**

**A. Cellular Biology**

- Demonstrate understanding of the structure and function of biologically important molecules
- Demonstrate knowledge of the structure and function of cells and their organelles, including membranes
- Demonstrate understanding of photosynthesis and cellular respiration, and the role of enzymes in these

- processes
- Demonstrate understanding of the structure of genes and their function, including the roles of DNA and RNA

## B. Biology of Organisms

- Identify the five major kingdoms and what determines placement of an organism into one of these kingdoms
- Demonstrate understanding of the structure and function of plant and animal organ systems (for example, reproduction, development, growth, waste removal)
- \*Demonstrate understanding of basic principles of heredity (for example, simple Mendelian genetics, genetic disorders)

## C. Ecology, Interrelationships in the Biosphere

- Identify the types and characteristics (physical and biological) of ecosystems
- \*Demonstrate understanding of energy flow, food webs and chains, and biogeochemical cycles, including decomposers and nutrient recycling
- Demonstrate understanding of biological communities, including intraspecific and interspecific relationships, succession, and diversity

## D. Evolution

- \*Demonstrate understanding of evolutionary mechanisms (for example, mutation, genetic recombination, natural selection)
- Demonstrate understanding of evolutionary patterns (for example, adaptation, speciation, extinction)
- Identify evidence for evolutionary change (for example, fossils, biochemical data, homology, mimicry)
- Demonstrate knowledge of life as related to the geological timeline (for example, origin of life, diversity of life forms, human evolution)

# II. Geosciences (33%)

## A. Astronomy

- \*Demonstrate knowledge of the solar system and planetary systems (for example, characteristics of the planets and their satellites, comets, asteroids)
- Demonstrate understanding of stars and galaxies (for example, properties of the Sun, stars, galaxies, stellar evolution)
- Demonstrate understanding of cosmology (for example, time-space relationship, origin and evolution of the solar system, and universe)

## B. Geology

- Demonstrate knowledge of earth materials (for example, minerals and rocks)
- \*Demonstrate understanding of internal processes and the structure of the Earth (for example, igneous activity, volcanoes, plate tectonics)
- \*Demonstrate understanding of external processes and land forms (for example, weathering, erosion, transportation of surface materials, and surface features)
- Demonstrate knowledge of the history of the Earth and its life forms (for example, geologic time scale, dating techniques, principal geologic events)

## C. Meteorology

- Demonstrate knowledge of atmospheric composition and structure (for example, layers and their characteristics, clouds, precipitation, water cycle)
- Demonstrate understanding of atmospheric movement (for example, energy source, circulation patterns, pressure areas)
- \*Demonstrate understanding of weather and climate (for example, climate zones, storms, droughts)

## D. Oceanography

- Demonstrate knowledge of biological, chemical, geological, and physical aspects of the oceans (for example, origin, composition, geomorphic features, currents, tides, density)

# III. Physical Sciences (33%)



A. Structure and Classification of Matter

- Demonstrate understanding of states, elements, periodic table, and physical and chemical properties

B. Reactions and Interactions

- Demonstrate understanding of kinetic theory, chemical bonding, reactions, acids, bases, and catalysts

C. Macromechanics

- Demonstrate understanding of types of motion, Newton's Laws of Motion, gravity, weight, mass, and conservation laws

D. Energy

- Demonstrate knowledge of sources, types, and transformations of energy (kinetic vs. potential, solar, chemical, nuclear, and electromagnetic)
- Demonstrate understanding of heat and temperature, including relationship to pressure, conduction, convection, and radiation of heat

E. Electricity and Magnetism

- Demonstrate knowledge of electricity, circuits, magnetism, and their applications

F. Wave Phenomena

- Demonstrate knowledge of electromagnetic spectrum, light, sound, and their applications (for example, mirrors, lenses, prisms, harmonics)

G. Modern Physics/Nuclear Chemistry

- Demonstrate knowledge of relativity, radioactivity, fusion, and fission

\* In the context of life science, geoscience, and/or physical science.

Specifications for the Content Area Exercises Section  
(Science Short Constructed-Response)

This section contains 3 short constructed-response questions. In each edition of the test, one question will come from each of the following areas:

- Biology (1 question)
- Geosciences (1 question)
- Physical Sciences (1 question)

A question from the area of Science, Technology and Society will be incorporated into one of the topics listed above.

Within the area of Biology, the question will pertain to the biology of organisms, ecology, interrelationships in the biosphere, or evolution as shown on the content description.

Within the area of the Geosciences, the question will pertain to Geology as shown on the content description.

Within the area of the Physical Sciences, the question will pertain to matter, energy, or electricity and magnetism as shown on the content description.

Within the area of Science, Technology and Society, the question will be specific within the content of life science, geoscience, or physical science.

Each of the 3 short constructed-response questions will assess one of the three skills listed below.

1. Explain and apply concepts (1 question)
2. Use of one or more of the following process skills: interpreting, ordering, categorizing, relating, inferring and/or

applying (1 question)

3. Design an experiment or investigation (1 question)

Matrix for the Content Area Exercises Section  
(Short Constructed Response)

**UNDERSTANDING AND USING SCIENCE**

<b>CONTENT DOMAIN</b>	Explain/apply concepts	Process skills	Design an experiment/investigation
Biology			
Geosciences			
Physical Sciences			
*Science, Technology and Society			

\* In the context of life science, geoscience, and/or physical science.

**THE PRAXIS SERIES:  
PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING  
TEACHERS®**

**TEST SPECIFICATIONS**

**MULTIPLE SUBJECTS ASSESSMENTS FOR TEACHERS**  
VISUAL AND PERFORMING ARTS

12 Multiple-Choice Questions  
2 Constructed-Response Questions

**TEST DESCRIPTION**

The four areas that comprise the visual and performing arts: dance, music, drama/theatre, and visual arts are represented proportionally in the Multiple Subjects Assessment for Teachers test.

Integral to each of the visual and performing arts are the four categories of aesthetic perception/creative expression; cultural heritage; aesthetic valuing; and creative expression.

The Visual and Performing Arts component of the Multiple Subjects Assessment for Teachers focuses on those categories that the limitations of the testing format established for the Assessment allow. Those limitations are as follows. (1) Each of the four categories is equally important, including creative expression. Although portfolio assessment would be required to test creative expression effectively, questions will be included that concentrate on aesthetic perception, cultural heritage, and aesthetic valuing, including creative expression to the extent possible. (2) Format is limited to black and white reproductions.

Questions are based, when appropriate, on visual stimulus material. These visuals, as well as written references to artists, art works, and movements, will recognize the multicultural and multiethnic nature of the arts. For each visual stimulus, complete bibliographic information will be printed in the Assessment materials, provided this information is not part of the answer to the question to which the visual stimulus is attached.

The questions included in the component emphasize basic ideas, concepts, and issues in the visual and performing arts, not recall of facts and details. The questions will allow beginning elementary school teachers to demonstrate and use skills such as analysis, interpretation, assessment, and synthesis. And, where possible, questions will require beginning teachers to integrate two or more of the four arts subject matter areas.

Because there are only two constructed-response questions in the Content Area Exercises section (constructed-response), the maintenance of the same weights for each of the major content categories in the Content Knowledge Section is impossible within any one edition of the Assessment. These weights will be maintained cumulatively, however, across several editions of the Assessment.

## CONTENTS

Dance  
Drama/Theatre  
Music and Visual Arts

Copyright© 1994. Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.

### CONTENT DESCRIPTION

#### I. **Dance** (20%)

##### A. Aesthetic Perception/Creative Expression

- Demonstrate knowledge of dance elements, including space, time, and energy
- Demonstrate knowledge of basic movement/dance concepts, including body and body parts, choreography, and creative movement and dance
- Demonstrate ability to differentiate among purposes and styles of dance, including artistic, social, and ethnic/folk

##### B. Cultural Heritage

- Demonstrate ability to relate dance works to one another and/or to their artistic, social, historical, cultural, and emotional context(s)

##### C. Aesthetic Valuing

- Demonstrate ability to determine aesthetic criteria
- Demonstrate ability to interpret the meaning of a dance piece both literally and metaphorically (for example, choreographer's intent and viewer's response)

NOTE: The parts of dance that overlap with physical education will be tested in the Physical Education component of the Assessment.

#### II. **Drama/Theatre** (20%)

##### A. Aesthetic Perception/Creative Expression

- Demonstrate knowledge of basic concepts of drama/theatre (for example, developing a character, technical elements, and dramatic structure)
- Demonstrate knowledge of basic drama/theatre vocabulary, including pantomime, improvisation, drama, and director

##### B. Cultural Heritage

- Demonstrate ability to relate drama/theatre works to one another and/or to their artistic, social, historical, cultural, and emotional context(s)

##### C. Aesthetic Valuing

- Demonstrate ability to interpret the meaning of a theatrical or dramatic work both literally and metaphorically
- Demonstrate ability to determine and apply criteria in making judgments about dramatic/theatrical works

NOTE: The parts of Drama/Theatre that overlap with literature and language studies will be covered in the Literature and Language Studies component of the Assessment

#### III. **Music** (30%)

##### A. Aesthetic Perception/Creative Expression

- Demonstrate knowledge of basic elements, concepts, and notation (for example, pitch, rhythm, form, tempo)
- Demonstrate ability to identify families of instruments
- Demonstrate ability to identify and/or link instruments by characteristics of sound (for example, length of pipe for wind instruments, length of string for stringed instruments)

#### B. Cultural Heritage

- Demonstrate ability to relate musical works and/or styles to one another and/or to their artistic, social, historical, cultural, and emotional context(s)
- Demonstrate ability to differentiate among musical styles
- Demonstrate ability to relate instruments to geographical and cultural context(s)

#### C. Aesthetic Valuing

- Demonstrate ability to determine criteria and apply them to composition and performance of musical works (for example, timbre, harmony)
- Demonstrate ability to identify the purposes of music with relation to specific geographic and cultural information

### IV. Visual Arts (30%)

#### A. Aesthetic Perception/Creative Expression in a Broad Range of Media

- Demonstrate knowledge of basic design elements (for example, color, line, value, shape/form)
- Demonstrate knowledge of basic principles of design (for example, contrast, emphasis, repetition, unity)
- Demonstrate knowledge of basic vocabulary as it relates to the visual arts (for example, perspective, composition, proportion, mass)

#### B. Cultural Heritage

- Demonstrate ability to relate artworks to one another and/or to their artistic, social, historical, cultural, and emotional context(s)
- Demonstrate ability to recognize how a class or group of artworks influence one another
- Demonstrate knowledge of the relation of the function/purpose of a given art work to its cultural context

#### C. Aesthetic Valuing

- Demonstrate ability to interpret the meaning of an artwork both literally and metaphorically
- Demonstrate ability to determine and apply criteria in making judgments about artworks

#### Specifications for the Content Area Exercises section (Visual and Performing Arts Short Constructed-Response)

The purpose of the Content Area Exercises section is to test breadth of thinking skills and knowledge in the seven content areas of the Assessment at a level that corresponds with lower-division coursework in subject matter preparation programs for beginning teachers.

The content of the short constructed-response questions will **focus** on three of the four categories identified in the Visual and Performing Arts Framework: cultural heritage (relating art works in a given art area to other art works in that area and/or to their artistic, social, historical, cultural, and emotional context), aesthetic valuing (demonstrating the ability to determine aesthetic criteria and apply them), and creative expression (to the extent possible). Because there are only two short constructed-response questions in each edition of the test, these categories will be rotated among the editions produced each year.

These questions are designed to test the following abilities:

- Analysis: the ability to see and describe the ways in which art elements and principles have been used in artworks
- Assessment: the ability to establish aesthetic criteria and apply them in order to make informed judgments about artworks
- Interpretation: the ability to explain the meanings in artworks
- Synthesis: the ability to combine analysis, assessment, and interpretation of artworks in an integrated vision

The questions will not focus solely on recall of factual information.

A combination of at least two of the process skills (listed above) must be embedded in each question.

Because four arts are covered (dance, music, drama/theatre, visual arts), an attempt will be made to distribute the four

across the three Assessment editions so that all are represented proportionally. For example, Assessment edition one might cover dance and visual arts, Assessment edition two might cover drama/theatre and music, and so on.

Where possible, a visual stimulus (such as black and white photographs of artworks, performances, diagrams, drawings) will serve as the basis for each question.

### Appendix B: Scoring Rubric for the MSAT Content Area Exercises

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 3 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates a thorough understanding of the most significant aspects of any stimulus material presented</li><li>• Responds appropriately to all parts of the question</li><li>• Where required, provides a strong explanation that is well supported by relevant evidence</li><li>• Demonstrates a strong knowledge of subject matter, concepts, theories, facts, procedures, or methodologies relevant to the question</li></ul>             |
| 2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates a basic understanding of the most significant aspects of any stimulus material presented</li><li>• Responds appropriately to most aspects of the question</li><li>• Where required, provides a strong explanation that is sufficiently supported by relevant evidence</li><li>• Demonstrates a sufficient knowledge of subject matter, concepts, theories, facts, procedures, or methodologies relevant to the question</li></ul> |
| 1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates a misunderstanding of significant aspects of any stimulus material presented</li><li>• Fails to respond appropriately to most parts of the question</li><li>• Where required, provides a weak explanation that is not well supported by relevant evidence</li><li>• Demonstrates a weak knowledge of subject matter, concepts, theories, facts, procedures, or methodologies relevant to the question</li></ul>                   |
| 0 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Blank, off-topic, or totally incorrect response; rephrases the question</li></ul>  |

### Appendix C: An Example of an MSAT Score Report

(Will be included in the Final Version of the Report)





# California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

**Meeting of:** November 3-4, 1999

**Agenda Item Number:** PERF-3

**Committee:** Performance Standards

**Title:** Report on the Validity of and Recommended Passing Standards on the RICA as a Requirement for the Education Specialist Instruction Credential

✓ Action

**Prepared by:** Linda M. Hooper, Ph.D., Assistant Consultant; Bpb Carlson, Ph.D., Administrator; and Marie Schrup, Ph.D., Consultant  
Professional Services Division

## Report on the Validity of and Recommended Passing Standards on the RICA as a Requirement for the Education Specialist Instruction Credential

Professional Services Division  
October 18, 1999

### Summary of an Agenda Report

#### Overview of this Report

AB 1178 (Cunneen, 1996) established the RICA as a requirement for the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential to assure that new teachers who will be responsible for reading instruction have the necessary knowledge, skills, and abilities. When AB 1178 was enacted, special education credential candidates were required to earn a basic teaching credential, and were, therefore, required to pass the RICA. In 1997, however, prior to the RICA's initial administration in 1998, the Commission changed the requirements for special education credentials, eliminating the requirement for a basic teaching credential. This *inadvertently* exempted special education candidates from having to pass the RICA. AB 2748 (Mazzoni, 1998) was enacted to rectify this situation. It requires Education Specialist Instruction Credential candidates to pass the RICA effective January 1, 2000. This report (a) summarizes the validity of the RICA for both Multiple Subject Teaching Credential candidates and Education Specialist Instruction Credential candidates and (b) recommends that the Commission adopt for Education Specialist Instruction Credential candidates the same RICA passing standards as adopted for Multiple Subject Teaching Credential candidates.

#### Relationship to the Commission's Strategic Goals and Objectives

*Goal One:* To promote educational excellence in California schools.

*Objective One:* Develop candidate and program standards.

*Objective Two:* Develop and administer teacher assessments.

## Policy Issue to be Resolved by the Commission

Should the Commission establish passing standards on the RICA as a requirement for the Education Specialist Instruction Credential that are the same as the passing standards on the RICA as a requirement for the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential?

### Fiscal Impact Statement

The cost of preparing this report is supported from the agency's base budget.

### Recommendation

That the Commission adopt the same passing standards on the RICA as a requirement for the Education Specialist Instruction Credential that the Commission previously adopted on the RICA as a requirement for the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential.

## Summary

AB 1178 (Cunneen, 1996) established the RICA as a requirement for the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential to assure that new teachers who will be responsible for reading instruction have the necessary knowledge, skills, and abilities. When AB 1178 was enacted, special education credential candidates were required to earn a basic teaching credential, and were, therefore, required to pass the RICA. In 1997, however, prior to the RICA's initial administration in 1998, the Commission changed the requirements for special education credentials, eliminating the requirement for a basic teaching credential. This *inadvertently* exempted special education candidates from having to pass the RICA. AB 2748 (Mazzoni, 1998) was enacted to rectify this situation. It requires Education Specialist Instruction Credential candidates to pass the RICA effective January 1, 2000. This report (a) summarizes the validity of the RICA for both Multiple Subject Teaching Credential candidates and Education Specialist Instruction Credential candidates and (b) recommends that the Commission adopt the same passing standards on the RICA as a requirement for the Education Specialist Instruction Credential that the Commission previously adopted on the RICA as a requirement for the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential.

## The Concept of Validity

Although people often refer to the "validity of a test," by, for example, stating that a specific test "is valid," the concept of validity is more closely related to proposed test score *interpretations* than to the test itself. Validity is an overall evaluation of the degree to which evidence and theory support the interpretations of test scores entailed by specific uses of tests.

Interpretations of test scores are often based on the ways in which the test scores will be used. For example, a test of mathematics achievement could be used to place a student in an appropriate instructional program, to endorse a high school diploma, or to inform a college admissions decision. Each of these uses implies a somewhat different interpretation of the mathematics achievement test scores: that a student will benefit from a particular instructional intervention, that a student has mastered a specified curriculum, or that a student is likely to be successful with college level work. It is unlikely that the same test would yield appropriate test score interpretations for all three uses. Thus, it is not the test itself whose validity needs to be evaluated, but the interpretations of the test scores for a particular purpose.

For licensing examinations, such as those used by the Commission, the passing standard plays a central role in test score interpretations. The Commission typically interprets a test score at or above the passing standard as indicating that the candidate has the minimally necessary knowledge and skills in the area being tested. Conversely, the Commission interprets a test score below the passing standard as indicating that the candidate does not have the required knowledge and skills in the area being tested.

## The RICA and the Commission's Interpretation of RICA Scores for Multiple Subject Teaching Credential Candidates

The Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA), developed pursuant to AB 1178 (Cunneen, 1996; Education Code Section 44283), includes two assessments: the RICA

Written Examination and the RICA Video Performance Assessment. The law requires that most candidates for an initial Multiple Subject Teaching Credential pass one of the two RICA assessments (their choice).<sup>1</sup> A summary of the RICA Content Specifications is provided on the next page and the complete specifications are appended.

<sup>1</sup>Exceptions are (a) candidates who hold valid California teaching credentials other than internship credentials, internship certificates, and emergency permits and (b) candidates who hold valid teaching credentials issued by jurisdictions in the United States other than California.

The RICA has been developed as a measure of a beginning teacher's (i.e., a candidate for an initial teaching credential) knowledge, skills, and abilities in the area of reading instruction. Pursuant to state law, the Commission uses the RICA as a licensing requirement. The interpretation of RICA test scores made by the Commission is that candidates who pass the RICA (i.e., achieve or exceed the Commission-adopted passing standard) have the knowledge, skills, and abilities needed by a beginning teacher for the teaching of reading; candidates who fail the RICA do not have the reading-related knowledge, skills, and abilities needed by a beginning teacher.

The process used to develop the RICA provides substantial evidence for the soundness and appropriateness (i.e., validity) of this interpretation. Throughout the process, from initial discussions about the content of the RICA through standard-

**Outline of the RICA Content Specifications**

Domain I:	Planning and Organizing Reading Instruction Based on Ongoing Assessment
Content Areas:	
1.	Conducting Ongoing Assessment of Reading Development
2.	Planning, Organizing, and Managing Reading Instruction
Domain II:	Developing Phonological and Other Linguistic Processes Related to Reading
Content Areas:	
3.	Phonemic Awareness
4.	Concepts About Print
5.	Systematic, Explicit Phonics and Other Word Identification Strategies
6.	Spelling Instruction
Domain III:	Developing Reading Comprehension and Promoting Independent Reading
Content Areas:	
7.	Reading Comprehension
8.	Literary Response and Analysis
9.	Content-Area Literacy
10.	Student Independent Reading
Domain IV:	Supporting Reading Through Oral and Written Language Development
Content Areas:	
11.	Relationships Among Reading, Writing, and Oral Language
12.	Vocabulary Development
13.	Structure of the English Language



setting, the interpretation to be made on the basis of a candidate's performance on the RICA was a primary focus. Key development activities that support the validity of the interpretation include the following.<sup>2</sup>

1. An advisory panel consisting of teachers, teacher educators, reading specialists, and other California educators played a key role throughout the development process. These practitioners and experts in reading instruction drafted the RICA Content Specifications (with input from other teachers and reading specialists) and developed and reviewed test questions and other assessment materials, including scoring materials.
2. The Commission sponsored a job analysis of the teaching of reading to identify the knowledge, skills, and abilities needed to teach reading, and those needed by a beginning teacher. Over 900 California teachers, teacher educators, and reading specialists participated in the job analysis.
3. Results of the job analysis were used to develop draft content specifications, which were the subject of a statewide validity study. Approximately 1,200 California teachers and teacher educators provided their judgments of the importance for the teaching of reading by a beginning teacher of each of the knowledge, skills, and abilities in the draft content specifications. The validity study also included an analysis of the congruence of the RICA Content Specifications with relevant California laws and policies.
4. The RICA Content Specifications were finalized based on the results of the validity study. All test materials, developed to reflect the content specifications, were field-tested and revised, when necessary, on the basis of field-test results.
5. All RICA test materials were reviewed by a committee of California educators specially trained and experienced in detecting and removing any elements that might be offensive to or unfairly penalize candidates on the basis of personal characteristics irrelevant to the knowledge, skills, and abilities being assessed (e.g., gender, ethnicity).
6. Following the initial administration of the RICA, 48 California teachers and teacher educators reviewed and discussed test materials and candidate performance and recommended passing standards for both the Written Examination and the Video Performance Assessment. Their focus was on the level of competence needed by beginning teachers. The Commission adopted RICA passing standards on the basis of these recommendations.

---

<sup>2</sup>The development of the RICA has been documented more fully in the following formal reports as well as in several Commission agenda reports.

Rosenfeld, M., Kocher, G. G., & Zack, J. (1997). *A Job Analysis of the Teaching of Reading: Identifying the Teacher Tasks, Knowledge, and Abilities Important for the Competent Delivery of a Balanced, Comprehensive Reading Curriculum in California*. A study conducted on behalf of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing by Educational Testing Service.

National Evaluation Systems, Inc. (1997). *Development and Validation of the Content Specifications for the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA)*. A report prepared for the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Carlson, R. (1998). *Establishing Passing Standards on the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA) as a Requirement for the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential*. Sacramento, CA: California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

These six key activities assure that the interpretation of RICA scores made by the Commission about credential candidates' competence in reading instruction is valid.

## **The RICA and Candidates for Special Education Credentials**

The Legislature's and Governor's purpose in enacting AB 1178 and requiring passage of the RICA by Multiple Subject Teaching Credential candidates was to assure that new

teachers who will be responsible for reading instruction have the necessary knowledge, skills, and abilities. At the time AB 1178 was enacted (September 1996), candidates for special education credentials were required to hold a basic teaching credential (e.g., Multiple Subject Teaching Credential). Thus, in enacting AB 1178, the lawmakers intended that candidates for special education credentials be required to pass the RICA. In 1997, however, prior to the RICA's initial administration in 1998, the Commission adopted new standards and regulations for the preparation and credentialing of special education teachers. A significant change was that candidates for special education credentials no longer needed to earn a basic teaching credential. This *inadvertently* exempted special education candidates from having to pass the RICA.

AB 2748 (Mazzoni, 1998, Education Code Section 44283.2) was enacted by lawmakers to close this unintentional loophole. The new law specifies that, effective January 1, 2000, each candidate for an initial Education Specialist Instruction Credential (special education) "shall be required to demonstrate that he or she passed the reading instruction competence assessment developed pursuant to Section 44283."

As described above, the RICA has been developed such that the interpretation of RICA test scores in relation to Multiple Subject Teaching Credential candidates' competence in reading instruction is well supported. AB 2748 requires that an additional group of credential candidates (i.e., candidates for initial Education Specialist Instruction Credentials) pass the RICA, for the same purpose as Multiple Subject Teaching Credential candidates: to assure that new teachers who will be responsible for reading instruction have the necessary knowledge, skills, and abilities. Thus, the Commission will need to make the same (well-supported) interpretation of RICA test scores for special education credential candidates as it does for Multiple Subject Teaching Credential candidates, specifically that if a candidate passes the RICA, the candidate has the knowledge, skills, and abilities needed by a beginning teacher for the teaching of reading, and if a candidate fails the RICA, the candidate does not have the reading-related knowledge, skills, and abilities needed by a beginning teacher. Because the RICA test score interpretation to be made is the same for both groups, the RICA is an appropriate assessment of the reading competence of special education credential candidates.

### **Recommended RICA Passing Standards for Education Specialist Instruction Credential Candidates**

Because (a) the interpretation of RICA test scores made by the Commission in relation to Multiple Subject Teaching Credential and Education Specialist Instruction Credential candidates' competence in reading instruction will be the same, and (b) that interpretation is based on the RICA passing standards, it would be most appropriate to establish the same passing standards for both groups. In August 1998, the Commission adopted the following passing standards for the RICA as a requirement for the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential:

RICA Written Examination: 81 points out of a total possible of 120

RICA Video Performance Assessment: 17 points out of a total possible of 24

Staff recommends that the Commission adopt the above passing standards for the RICA as a requirement for the Education Specialist Instruction Credential.

### **Additional Supporting Information**

The discussions above summarize the primary rationale for the appropriateness of the RICA for Education Specialist Instruction Credential candidates and for establishing the same RICA passing standards for those candidates as previously established for Multiple Subject Teaching Credential candidates. Additional supporting information is provided below.

1. When AB 1178 established the RICA, special education credential candidates, who at that time had to earn a basic teaching credential, were among those who had to pass the RICA. AB 2748 simply rectifies an exemption for them created when the Commission eliminated the requirement that special education credential candidates earn a basic teaching credential. Furthermore, it can be inferred that lawmakers wanted Education Specialist Instruction Credential candidates held to the same

standard on the RICA as Multiple Subject Teaching Credential candidates because AB 2748 does not indicate or imply different passing standards.

2. The RICA was developed for *beginning* teachers (i.e., credential candidates). The passing standards were adopted as reasonable expectations for beginning teachers. The Education Specialist Instruction Credential candidates will also be required to pass the RICA as beginning teachers (credential candidates).
3. Education Specialist Instruction Credential holders have similar reading-related responsibilities and training as Multiple Subject Teaching Credential holders. Approximately 80 percent of learning disabled students have difficulty with reading skills, so special educators need competence in reading instruction.<sup>3</sup> The majority of California students eligible for special education services are assigned to regular classes for at least 50 percent of the school day. Special educators act as consultants and collaborators with teachers in these mainstream settings. Therefore, special educators need an understanding of the curriculum required in the regular classroom. All special education teaching credential programs include general education coursework and field experience, including a reading course. Most institutions with accredited special education programs in California are requiring candidates to complete many of the same methods courses as Multiple Subject Teaching Credential candidates, in addition to other coursework and field experiences related to pinpointing specific areas of weakness in reading performance and expertise in effective remedial strategies to address the needs of children with reading disabilities.
4. Commission staff interviewed 14 California experts in special education who are familiar with the RICA. Most are involved in the preparation of special education teachers and teach a reading course. The interviews focused on (a) the congruence of the RICA's content with the knowledge, skills, and abilities Education Specialist Instruction Credential candidates need to be effective reading teachers, and (b) RICA passing standards for Education Specialist Instruction Credential candidates. Of the 14 participants, 12 stated that Education Specialist Instruction Credential candidates need the knowledge, skills, and abilities assessed on the RICA. (Nine indicated that these candidates need additional knowledge, skills, and abilities; two did not feel comfortable making a judgment.) Nine of the participants stated that the RICA passing standards for Education Specialist Instruction Credential candidates should be the same as for Multiple Subject Teaching Credential candidates. (Two said the passing standards for Education Specialist Instruction Credential candidates should be higher; three did not feel comfortable making a judgment.)

---

<sup>3</sup>Kavale, K.A., & Reese, J.H. (1992). The character of learning disabilities: An Iowa profile. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 15 (2), 74-94.

---

## **Appendix**

### **RICA Content Specifications**

The goal of reading instruction is to develop competent, thoughtful readers who are able to use, interpret, and appreciate all types of text. Beginning teachers need to be able to deliver effective reading instruction that is based on the results of ongoing assessment; reflects knowledge of state and local reading standards for different grade levels; represents a balanced, comprehensive reading curriculum; and is sensitive to the needs of all students. The knowledge and abilities needed by beginning teachers are described below, organized into four domains. Competence in *all four* of the domains is critical and necessary for achieving the goals of reading instruction.

**Domain I - Planning and Organizing Reading Instruction Based on Ongoing Assessment**

**Domain II - Developing Phonological and Other Linguistic Processes Related to Reading**

**Domain III - Developing Reading Comprehension and Promoting Independent Reading**

**Domain IV - Supporting Reading Through Oral and Written Language Development**

## Important Notes About the RICA Content Specifications

1. Each domain includes two or more content areas. The order of the content areas and the order of the competency statements within each content area do not indicate relative importance or value.
2. Many of the competencies include examples. The examples are not comprehensive. They are provided to help clarify the knowledge and abilities described in the competency.
3. The competencies pertain to the teaching of reading in English, even though many of the competencies may also be relevant to the teaching of reading in other languages.
4. Each competency refers to the provision of instruction to all students, including English language learners, speakers of non-mainstream English, and students with special needs. Instruction should be characterized by a sensitivity to and respect for the culture and language of the students, and should be based on students' developmental, linguistic, functional, and age-appropriate needs; that is, instruction should be provided in ways that meet the needs of the individual student.

### **DOMAIN I: PLANNING AND ORGANIZING READING INSTRUCTION BASED ON ONGOING ASSESSMENT**

#### **CONTENT AREA 1: Conducting Ongoing Assessment of Reading Development**

Ongoing assessment of reading development refers to the use of multiple measures and the ongoing analysis of individual, small-group, and class progress in order to plan effective instruction and, when necessary, classroom interventions. All instruction should be based on information acquired through valid assessment procedures. Students must be able to recognize their own reading strengths and needs and be able to apply strategies for increasing their own reading competence. Teachers must be able to use and interpret a variety of informal and formal assessment tools and communicate assessment data effectively to students, parents, guardians, school personnel, and others.

- 1.1 **Principles of assessment.** The beginning teacher knows how to collect and use assessment data from multiple measures on an ongoing basis to inform instructional decisions. The teacher is able to select and administer informal reading assessments in all areas of reading and to analyze the results of both informal and formal reading assessments to plan reading instruction.
- 1.2 **Assessing reading levels.** The beginning teacher is able to use a variety of informal measures to determine students' independent, instructional, and frustration levels of reading. The teacher conducts these assessments throughout the school year and uses the results to select materials and plan and implement effective instruction for individuals and small and large groups in all areas of reading.
- 1.3 **Using and communicating assessment results.** The beginning teacher knows what evidence demonstrates that a student is performing below, at, or above expected levels of performance based on content standards and applies this information when interpreting and using assessment results. The teacher is able to recognize when a student needs additional help in one or more areas of reading, plans and implements timely interventions to address identified needs, and recognizes when a student may need additional help beyond the classroom. The teacher is able to communicate assessment results and reading progress to students, parents, guardians, school personnel, and others.

#### **CONTENT AREA 2: Planning, Organizing, and Managing Reading Instruction**

Planning, organizing, and managing reading instruction refer to teacher practices necessary for delivering an effective, balanced, comprehensive reading program. Students' reading development is supported by a well-planned and organized program

that is based on content and performance standards in reading and responsive to the needs of individual students. Students must develop as proficient readers in order to become effective learners and take advantage of the many lifelong benefits of reading. Teachers need to understand how to plan, organize, manage, and differentiate instruction to support all students' reading development.

- 2.1 Factors involved in planning reading instruction.** The beginning teacher is able to plan instruction based on state and local content and performance standards in reading. The teacher knows the components of a balanced, comprehensive reading program (see Content Areas 1 and 3 through 13) and the interrelationships among these components. The teacher is able to do short- and long-term planning in reading and develop reading lessons that reflect knowledge of the standards and understanding of a balanced, comprehensive reading program. The teacher reflects on his or her reading instruction and uses this and other professional development resources and activities to plan effective reading instruction.
- 2.2 Organizing and managing reading instruction.** The beginning teacher understands that the goal of reading instruction is to develop reading competence in all students, including English language learners, speakers of non-mainstream English, and students with special needs, and the teacher knows how to manage, organize, and differentiate instruction in all areas of reading to accomplish this goal (e.g., by using flexible grouping, individualizing reading instruction, planning and implementing timely interventions, and providing differentiated and/or individualized instruction). The teacher knows how to select and use instructional materials and create a learning environment that promotes student reading (e.g., by organizing independent and instructional reading materials and effectively managing their use, by taking advantage of resources and equipment within the school and the larger educational community).

**DOMAIN II:  
DEVELOPING PHONOLOGICAL AND OTHER LINGUISTIC PROCESSES RELATED TO  
READING**

**CONTENT AREA 3: Phonemic Awareness**

Phonemic awareness is the conscious awareness that words are made up of individual speech sounds (phonemes), and it is strongly related to reading achievement. To become effective readers, students must be able to perceive and produce the specific sounds of the English language and understand how the sound system works. Therefore, teachers must understand how and why phonemic awareness skills develop both before students are reading and as they are learning to read. Teachers need to know how to plan implicit and systematic, explicit instruction in phonemic awareness and how to choose a variety of materials and activities that provide clear examples for the identification, comparison, blending, substitution, deletion, and segmentation of sounds. Teachers need to analyze students' spoken language development in order to match instruction with the students' needs.

- 3.1 Assessing phonemic awareness.** The beginning teacher knows how to assess students' auditory awareness, discrimination of sounds, and spoken language for the purpose of planning instruction in phonemic awareness that meets students' needs.
- 3.2 The role of phonemic awareness.** The beginning teacher knows ways in which phonemic awareness is related to reading achievement both before students are reading and as they are learning to read. The teacher understands the instructional progression for helping students acquire phonemic awareness skills (i.e., words, syllables, onsets and rimes, and phonemes).
- 3.3 Developing phonemic awareness.** The beginning teacher is able to promote students' understanding that words are made up of sounds. The teacher knows how to achieve this goal by delivering appropriate, motivating instruction, both implicitly and explicitly, in auditory awareness and discrimination of sounds, phoneme awareness (e.g., teaching students how to rhyme, blend, substitute, segment, and delete sounds in words), and word awareness (i.e., recognition of word boundaries).

The teacher is able to select materials and activities for teaching phonemic awareness skills that are appropriate for students at different stages of reading development.

## CONTENT AREA 4: Concepts About Print

Concepts about print refer to an understanding of how letters, words, and sentences are represented in written language, and these concepts play a critical role in students' learning to read. Students need to understand that ideas can be represented in print forms and that print forms may have unique characteristics that differ from oral representations of those same ideas. Teachers need to know that if a student does not demonstrate understanding of concepts about print and the written language system, then these concepts must be explicitly taught.

- 4.1 **Assessing concepts about print.** The beginning teacher is able to assess students' understanding of concepts about print and knows how to use assessment results to plan appropriate instruction in this area.
- 4.2 **Concepts about print.** The beginning teacher knows the instructional progression of concepts about print (e.g., sentence, word, and letter representation; directionality; tracking of print; understanding that print carries meaning). The teacher is able to select appropriate materials and activities and to provide effective instruction in these concepts.
- 4.3 **Letter recognition.** The beginning teacher knows the importance of teaching upper- and lower-case letter recognition and is able to select, design, and use engaging materials and activities, including multisensory techniques (visual, auditory, kinesthetic, tactile), to help students recognize letter shapes and learn the names of letters.

## CONTENT AREA 5: Systematic, Explicit Phonics and Other Word Identification Strategies

Systematic, explicit phonics and other word identification strategies refer to an organized program in which letter-sound correspondences for letters and letter clusters are taught directly in a manner that gradually builds from basic elements to more complex patterns. Word identification strategies build on phoneme awareness and concepts about print. Skillful and strategic word identification plays a critical role in rapid, accurate decoding; reading fluency; and comprehension. Students must understand the alphabetic principle and conventions of written language so that they are able to apply these skills automatically when reading. Teachers must provide systematic, explicit instruction in phonics and other word identification strategies.

- 5.1 **Assessing phonics and other word identification strategies.** The beginning teacher is able to select and use a variety of appropriate informal and formal assessments to determine students' knowledge of and skills in applying phonics and other word identification strategies, including decoding tests, fluency checks (rate and accuracy), and sight word checks. The teacher is able to use this information to plan appropriate instruction.
- 5.2 **Explicit phonics instruction.** The beginning teacher knows that rapid, automatic decoding contributes to reading fluency and comprehension. The teacher is able to plan and implement systematic, explicit phonics instruction that is sequenced according to the increasing complexity of linguistic units. These units include phonemes, onsets and rimes, letters, letter combinations, syllables, and morphemes. The teacher is able to select published and teacher-developed instructional programs, materials, and activities that will be effective in the systematic, explicit teaching of phonics.
- 5.3 **Developing fluency.** The beginning teacher knows how to help students develop fluency and consolidate their word identification strategies through frequent

opportunities to read and reread decodable texts and other texts written at their independent reading levels. The teacher is able to select appropriate texts for supporting students' development of reading fluency.

- 5.4 **Word identification strategies.** The beginning teacher is able to model and explicitly teach students to use word identification strategies in reading for meaning, including graphophonic cues, syllable division, and morphology (e.g., use of affixes and roots), and to use context cues (semantic and syntactic) to resolve ambiguity. The teacher is able to select materials for teaching decoding and word identification strategies and knows how to model self-correction strategies and provide positive, explicit, corrective feedback for word identification errors.
- 5.5 **Sight words.** The beginning teacher is able to provide opportunities for mastery of common, irregular sight words through multiple and varied reading and writing experiences. The teacher is able to select materials and activities to develop and reinforce students' knowledge of sight words.
- 5.6 **Terminology.** The beginning teacher knows the terminology and concepts of decoding and other word identification strategies (e.g., consonant blends, consonant digraphs, vowel patterns, syllable patterns, orthography, morphology), and knows how phonemes, onsets and rimes, syllables, and morphemes are represented in print.

**CONTENT AREA 6: Spelling Instruction**

Spelling maps sounds to print. Spelling knowledge and word identification skills are strongly related. Students' knowledge of orthographic (spelling) patterns contributes to their word recognition, vocabulary development, and written expression. Teachers need to know the stages of spelling and be able to provide meaningful spelling instruction that includes systematic, explicit teaching of orthographic patterns (e.g., sound-letter correspondence, syllable patterns), morphology, etymology, and high-frequency words.

- 6.1 **Assessing spelling.** The beginning teacher is able to analyze and interpret students' spelling to assess their stages of spelling development (pre-phonetic, phonetic, transitional, conventional) and to use that information to plan appropriate spelling instruction.
- 6.2 **Systematic spelling instruction.** The beginning teacher is able to use a systematic plan for spelling instruction that relates to students' stages of spelling development. The teacher knows how to select spelling words and use deliberate, multisensory techniques to teach and reinforce spelling patterns. The teacher knows how the etymology and morphology of words relate to orthographic patterns in English, knows high-frequency words that do and do not conform to regular spelling patterns, and is able to utilize this knowledge in planning and implementing systematic spelling instruction.
- 6.3 **Spelling instruction in context.** The beginning teacher knows how to teach spelling in context and provides students with opportunities to apply and assess their spelling skills across the curriculum. The teacher knows how to plan spelling instruction that supports students' reading development (e.g., phonics skills, knowledge of morphology, vocabulary development) and writing development (e.g., use of decoding skills as a strategy for proofreading their spelling). The teacher is able to identify spelling words that support and reinforce instruction in these areas.

**DOMAIN III:  
DEVELOPING READING COMPREHENSION AND PROMOTING INDEPENDENT  
READING**

**CONTENT AREA 7: Reading Comprehension**

Reading comprehension refers to reading with understanding. Reading fluency and reading comprehension are necessary for learning in all content areas, sustaining interest in what is read, and deriving pleasure from reading. The end goal of reading instruction is to enable students to read with understanding and apply comprehension strategies to different types of texts for a variety of lifetime reading purposes. Effective readers

produce evidence of comprehension by clarifying the ideas presented in text and connecting them to other sources, including their own background knowledge. Teachers need to be able to facilitate students' comprehension and provide them with explicit instruction and guided practice in comprehension strategies.

- 7.1 **Assessing reading comprehension.** The beginning teacher is able to use informal and formal procedures to assess students' comprehension of narrative and expository texts and their use of comprehension strategies. The teacher knows how to use this information to provide effective instruction in reading comprehension.
- 7.2 **Fluency and other factors affecting comprehension.** The beginning teacher understands factors affecting reading comprehension (e.g., reading rate and fluency, word recognition, prior knowledge and experiences, vocabulary) and knows how proficient readers read. The teacher is able to use this knowledge to plan and deliver effective instruction in reading comprehension.
- 7.3 **Facilitating comprehension.** The beginning teacher is able to facilitate comprehension at various stages of students' reading development (e.g., before students learn to read, as they are learning to read, and as they become proficient readers). The teacher is able to select and use a range of activities and strategies before, during, and after reading to enhance students' comprehension (e.g., developing background knowledge, encouraging predictions, questioning, conducting discussions).
- 7.4 **Different levels of comprehension.** The beginning teacher knows the levels of comprehension and is able to model and explicitly teach comprehension skills. These include (a) literal comprehension skills (e.g., identifying explicitly stated main ideas, details, sequence, cause-effect relationships, and patterns); (b) inferential comprehension skills (e.g., inferring main ideas, details, comparisons, cause-effect relationships not explicitly stated; drawing conclusions or generalizations from a text; predicting outcomes); and (c) evaluative comprehension skills (e.g., recognizing instances of bias and unsupported inferences in texts; detecting propaganda and faulty reasoning; distinguishing between facts and opinions; reacting to a text's content, characters, and use of language). The teacher is able to select materials (both narrative and expository texts) to support effective instruction in these areas.
- 7.5 **Comprehension strategies.** The beginning teacher is able to model and explicitly teach a range of strategies students can use to clarify the meaning of text (e.g., self-monitoring, rereading, note taking, outlining, summarizing, mapping, using learning logs). The teacher knows how to select materials and create opportunities for guided and independent practice using comprehension strategies.

**CONTENT AREA 8: Literary Response and Analysis**

Literary response and analysis refer to a process in which students extend their understanding and appreciation of significant literary works representing a wide range of genres, perspectives, eras, and cultures. Literature provides readers with unique opportunities to reflect on their own experiences, investigate further ranges of human experience, gain access to unfamiliar worlds, and develop their own imaginative capacities. Students who are fully engaged in literature find a rich medium in which to explore language. Teachers need to provide explicit instruction and guided practice in responding to literature and analyzing literary text structures and elements.

- 8.1 **Assessing literary response and analysis.** The beginning teacher is able to assess students' responses to literature (e.g., making personal connections, analyzing text, providing evidence from text to support their responses) and use that information to plan appropriate instruction in these areas.
- 8.2 **Responding to literature.** The beginning teacher is able to select literature from a range of eras, perspectives, and cultures and provides students with frequent opportunities to listen to and read high-quality literature for different purposes. The teacher knows how to use a range of instructional approaches and activities for helping students apply comprehension strategies when reading literature and for developing students' responses to literature (e.g., using guided reading, reading logs,



and discussions about literature; encouraging students to connect elements in a text to other sources, including other texts, their experiences, and their background knowledge).

- 8.3 **Literary analysis.** The beginning teacher knows and can teach elements of literary analysis and criticism (e.g., describing and analyzing story elements, recognizing features of different literary genres, determining mood and theme, analyzing the use of figurative language, analyzing ways in which a literary work reflects the traditions and perspectives of a particular people or time period). The teacher is able to select literature that provides clear examples of these elements and that matches students' instructional needs and reading interests.

## **CONTENT AREA 9: Content-Area Literacy**

Content-area literacy refers to the ability to learn through reading. Learning in all content areas is supported by strong reading comprehension strategies and study skills. Students need to know how to apply a variety of reading comprehension strategies to different types of texts, analyze the structures and features of expository (informational) texts, and select and vary their reading strategies for different texts and purposes. Teachers need to model and provide explicit instruction in these skills and strategies and provide students with frequent opportunities for guided and independent practice using them.

- 9.1 **Assessing content-area literacy.** The beginning teacher is able to assess students' comprehension in content-area reading and use that information to provide effective instruction.
- 9.2 **Different types of texts and purposes for reading.** The beginning teacher knows and is able to teach students about different types and functions of text and the skills and strategies required for reading and comprehending different types of texts. The teacher is able to select texts that provide clear examples of common text structures (i.e., cause/effect, comparison/contrast, problem/solution) and knows how to model and explicitly teach students to use text structures to improve their comprehension and memory of expository texts. The teacher is able to model and teach reading strategies for different reading purposes (e.g., skimming, scanning, in-depth reading).
- 9.3 **Study skills.** The beginning teacher is able to model and explicitly teach study skills for locating and retrieving information from reference materials and content-area texts, for retaining and using information, and for test taking.

## **CONTENT AREA 10: Student Independent Reading**

Independent reading plays a critical role in promoting students' familiarity with language patterns, increasing fluency and vocabulary, broadening knowledge in content areas, and motivating further reading for information and pleasure. Independent reading improves reading performance. To become effective readers, students should be encouraged to read as frequently, broadly, and thoughtfully as possible. Teachers need to understand the importance of independent reading and know how to encourage and guide students in their independent reading.

- 10.1 **Encouraging independent reading.** The beginning teacher is able to determine each student's reading interests and preferences, survey the quantity and quality of students' reading, consider each student's independent reading level, and use that information to promote extensive independent reading. The teacher promotes student reading that extends beyond the core curriculum by providing daily opportunities for self-selected reading and frequent opportunities for sharing what is read. The teacher knows how to guide students in selecting independent reading materials and how to motivate students to read independently by regularly reading aloud to students from high-quality texts, providing access to a variety of reading materials, and suggesting texts that match student interests.
- 10.2 **Supporting at-home reading.** The beginning teacher is able to use a variety of

strategies to motivate students to read at home. The teacher encourages and provides support for parents or guardians to read to their children, in English and/or in the primary languages of English language learners, and/or to use additional strategies to promote literacy in the home. The teacher is able to select and organize, for various purposes, a range of reading materials at different levels in English and, when available, in the primary language(s) of the students in the classroom.

#### **DOMAIN IV:**

### **SUPPORTING READING THROUGH ORAL AND WRITTEN LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT**

#### **CONTENT AREA 11: Relationships Among Reading, Writing, and Oral Language**

An effective, comprehensive language arts program increases students' language facility through relevant daily opportunities to relate listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Reading is supported by effective writing, listening, and speaking instruction, and the goal of language arts instruction is to fully develop students' communication skills. Students must be able to connect reading, writing, listening, and speaking tasks to their experiences, intentions, and purposes. Teachers need to be aware of the interdependent nature of reading, writing, listening, and speaking and be able to use interrelated instruction in the four areas to promote reading proficiency.

- 11.1 Assessing oral and written language.** The beginning teacher is able to informally assess students' oral and written language and use that information when planning reading instruction.
- 11.2 Oral language development.** The beginning teacher knows how to provide formal and informal oral language opportunities across the curriculum that enhance students' development as readers (e.g., through language play, group discussions, questioning, and sharing information). The teacher helps students make connections between their oral language and reading and writing.
- 11.3 Written language development.** The beginning teacher is able to provide purposeful writing opportunities across the curriculum to enhance students' reading development. The teacher explicitly teaches the transfer of skills from oral language to written language. The teacher provides instruction in which reading, writing, and oral language are interrelated.
- 11.4 Supporting English language learners.** The beginning teacher is able to interrelate the elements of language arts instruction to support the reading development of English language learners (e.g., using preview-review, visual aids, charts, real objects, word organizers, graphic organizers, and outlining). The teacher knows general ways in which the writing systems of other languages may differ from English (e.g., that not all writing systems are alphabetic, that English is less regular phonetically than some other alphabetic languages). The teacher understands factors and processes involved in transferring literacy competencies from one language to another (e.g., positive and negative transfer) and uses knowledge of language similarities and differences to promote transfer of language skills (e.g., through scaffolding strategies, modeling, and explicit instruction).

#### **CONTENT AREA 12: Vocabulary Development**

Vocabulary constitutes the building blocks of language. Vocabulary knowledge plays a critical role in reading comprehension, and readers learn most vocabulary through wide reading. Students need to know how to use a range of strategies, including those involving word analysis, context, and syntax, that promote reading fluency and enable independent comprehension, interpretation, and application of words contained in narrative and expository text. Upon entering school, students have a listening and speaking vocabulary that forms the foundation for vocabulary and comprehension instruction. Teachers need to build upon this foundation by providing explicit instruction in vocabulary development and in determining the meaning and accurate use of unfamiliar words encountered through listening and reading.

- 12.1 **Assessing vocabulary knowledge.** The beginning teacher is able to informally assess students' vocabulary knowledge in relation to specific reading needs and texts and is able to use that information to plan appropriate vocabulary instruction.
- 12.2 **Increasing vocabulary knowledge.** The beginning teacher knows how to provide opportunities for students to increase their vocabulary by listening to and reading a variety of texts and encourages students to apply their vocabulary knowledge in new contexts. The teacher is able to select vocabulary words on the basis of appropriate criteria (e.g., words that are related to each other, words needed to comprehend a reading selection). The teacher knows how to select appropriate instructional materials (e.g., read-aloud materials that promote vocabulary development and lay the foundation for complex language structures) and is able to teach vocabulary using a range of instructional activities (e.g., word sorts, word banks, classification, semantic mapping).
- 12.3 **Strategies for gaining and extending meanings of words.** The beginning teacher is able to model and explicitly teach students a variety of strategies for gaining meaning from unfamiliar words, such as using word analysis (e.g., decoding, prefixes and suffixes, base words, roots), context, and syntax. The teacher knows how to select and use materials and activities that help students extend their understanding of words, including words with multiple meanings. The teacher is able to provide instruction in the use of reference materials that can help clarify the meaning of words (e.g., dictionary, thesaurus, glossary, technological sources).

### CONTENT AREA 13: Structure of the English Language

Structure of the English language refers to established rules for the use of the language. Students' knowledge of the structure of English promotes their reading fluency, listening and reading comprehension, and oral and written expression. Students must be able to recognize, when listening or reading, and apply, when speaking or writing, English language conventions and structures. Teachers need a basic knowledge of English conventions and the structure of the English language (sentence structure, grammar, punctuation, capitalization, spelling, syntax, and semantics) and must be able to provide instruction in these areas to enhance students' literacy skills.

- 13.1 **Assessing English language structures.** The beginning teacher is able to analyze students' oral and written language to determine their understanding and use of English language structures and conventions and knows how to use this information to plan appropriate instruction.
- 13.2 **Differences between written and oral English.** The beginning teacher is able to help students understand similarities and differences between language structures used in spoken and written English. The teacher knows how to use explicit instruction and guided practice to teach written-language structures to all students. The teacher uses a range of approaches and activities to develop students' facility in comprehending and using academic language (e.g., oral language development activities to build knowledge of academic language and familiarize students with grammatical structures they will encounter in written text).
- 13.3 **Applying knowledge of the English language to improve reading.** The beginning teacher has a basic knowledge of English syntax and semantics and is able to use this knowledge to improve students' reading competence (e.g., by teaching students to group words into meaningful phrases to increase reading fluency and comprehension, by teaching students to analyze how punctuation affects a text's meaning). The beginning teacher knows how to help students interpret and apply English grammar and language conventions in authentic reading, writing, listening, and speaking contexts. The teacher is able to help students consolidate their knowledge of English grammar and improve their reading fluency and comprehension by providing frequent opportunities to listen to, read, and reread materials that provide clear examples of specific English grammatical structures and conventions.



[Back to the Top](#) |

[Back to November 1999 Agenda](#) |

[Return to "Agenda Archives"](#) |

[Return to "About CTC"](#) |





## California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

**Meeting of:** November 3-4, 1999

**Agenda Item Number:** FPPC-1

**Committee:** Fiscal Planning and Policy

**Title:** Update on the Management Study Mandated by the 1999 Budget Act

✓ Information

**Prepared by:** Joseph R. Radding, Director  
Information Technology and Support Management Division

---

### BACKGROUND

The Commission's budget as contained in the 1999 Budget Act includes a provision that requires the transfer of up to \$250,000 to the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) for the purpose of contracting for a comprehensive management study of the Commission's organizational structure and credential processing protocols. This item provides an update on the progress of this contract.

### SUMMARY

The Request for Proposals document for this management study provided that the deadline for the submission of proposals in response to the RFP study was September 22, 1999. Two proposals were received by the deadline.

The two proposals underwent considerable review and extensive discussion by representatives of the LAO, the Department of Finance, and the Commission. Ultimately, a consensus emerged that the proposal of MGT of America, Inc. (MGT), at a cost of \$250,000, was the proposal that best met the RFP's selection criteria.

MGT is a national management consulting firm based in Tallahassee, Florida, with a western regional office in Sacramento, California. The organization, which has been in operation for 25 years, has conducted studies on behalf of various state government agencies, school districts, and other municipal entities.

After verifying MGT's references concerning projects of a similar nature and scope, MGT was invited to an interview that was conducted on October 7, 1999. Following the interview, MGT was notified that it had been selected for award of the contract.

Although the contract governing this study will be between the LAO and MGT, staff has provided numerous suggestions for provisions that have been incorporated into the contract. Pending the execution of the contract, the study is expected to commence in late October 1999.

Staff will continue to provide Commissioners with periodic updates regarding the status of the study.



[Back to the Top](#) |  
[Back to November 1999 Agenda](#)  
[Return to "Agenda Archives"](#) |  
[Return to "About CTC"](#) |





## California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

**Meeting of:** November 3-4, 1999

**Agenda Item Number:** FPPC-2

**Committee:** Fiscal Planning and Policy

**Title:** First Quarter Report of Revenues and Expenditures for Fiscal Year 1999-2000

✓ Information

**Prepared by:** Joseph R. Radding, Director  
Information Technology and Support Management Division

---

### BACKGROUND

As previously scheduled in the Commission's quarterly calendar, staff is presenting the Commission's revenue and expenditure data for the first quarter of fiscal year 1999-2000.

### SUMMARY

Enclosed are two charts that depict the Commission's revenues and expenditures for the first quarter of fiscal year 1999-2000. To aid in understanding what the various totals mean, Commission staff has compiled the following explanatory notes:

#### *Revenues*

- In updating the Commission's current year revenue estimates, staff projected an eight percent increase in Teacher Credentials Fund (TCF) revenue for the 1999-2000 fiscal year. As of the end of September 1999, the amount of TCF revenue received is in line with that projection. Traditionally, TCF revenue is received in higher amounts between July and November of each year and then drops off until the following May.
- Examination revenue in the Test Development and Administration Account (TDAA) is received sporadically throughout the year, generally within four to six weeks after each examination administration. The revenue received thus far is indicative of only one administration of the RICA and CBEST.

#### *Expenditures*

- The "Personal Services" expenditures versus budgeted amounts is indicative of "salary savings" related to new and existing vacant positions that are currently in various stages of recruitment.
- The "Operating Expenses & Equipment" and "Total Program Cost" columns include actual expenditures plus encumbrances (expenses that the Commission has obligated itself to incur at a future date). The relatively low percentage of the amount expended out of the total amount budgeted is due primarily to contracts that the Commission has approved (such as the federally funded contracts approved by the Commission in October 1999) for which funds have not yet been encumbered.



| [Back to the Top](#) |  
| [Back to November 1999 Agenda](#)  
| [Return to "Agenda Archives"](#) |  
| [Return to "About CTC"](#) |





## California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

**Meeting of:** November 3-4, 1999

**Agenda Item Number:** FPPC-3

**Committee:** Fiscal Planning and Policy

**Title:** Proposed 2000-2001 Budget Change Proposal Related to the Implementation of Assembly Bill 471 (Scott) Pertaining to Mandated Credential Reporting

✓ Action

**Prepared by:** Karen Romo, Analyst  
Fiscal and Business Services

---

### BACKGROUND

On September 15, 1999, Governor Gray Davis signed the Commission- sponsored Assembly Bill 471 (Scott, Chapter 381, Statutes of 1999), which takes effect on January 1, 2000. Contained within the provisions of this bill is Education Code Section 44225.6, which requires the Commission to report by January 10th of each year on the number of classroom teachers who received credentials, internships, waivers, and emergency permits in the previous fiscal year.

### SUMMARY

Pursuant to Budget Letter 99-04, Budget Change Proposals (BCPs) which request funding for legislation enacted after August 27, 1999, must be submitted to the Department of Finance (DOF) no later than 10 working days after chaptering of a bill.

The attached BCP was transmitted to the DOF on September 29, 1999 with an explanation that it had not yet been approved by the Commission. The BCP requests additional spending authority from the Teacher Credentials Fund of \$68,000 in fiscal year 1999-2000 and \$84,000 in fiscal year 2000-2001, and the establishment of one new staff position effective immediately, to implement and administer the provisions of Assembly Bill 471.

### RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Commission approve the BCP as presented.

---

 | [Back to the Top](#) |  
| [Back to November 1999 Agenda](#)  
| [Return to "Agenda Archives"](#) |  
| [Return to "About CTC"](#) |





## California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

**Meeting of:** November 3-4, 1999

**Agenda Item Number:** FPPC-4

**Committee:** Fiscal Planning and Policy

**Title:** Status of the Commission's Year 2000 Readiness

✓ Information

**Prepared by:** Rosie Yurman, IS Analyst  
Information Management Systems

---

### BACKGROUND

In February 1999, Governor Gray Davis issued Executive Order D-3-99 in which he proclaimed Year 2000 (Y2K) solutions as the State's top technology priority (see attached). Among its many stipulations, the Executive Order contains recommendations on testing systems and developing business continuity plans, and establishes a Year 2000 Project Office in the Department of Information Technology (DOIT) to assess departmental Year 2000 efforts.

### SUMMARY

Nearly two years ago, Commissioners directed that resources be allocated to safeguard the integrity of the Commission's automated systems and the information stored on those systems. In particular, the Commission's Credential Automation System (CAS) contains the credential and fingerprint status of more than 500,000 teachers, administrators, and service personnel who are serving or have served in California's public schools. CAS has been deemed by the DOIT as a "mission critical information technology system" in recognition of the role that CAS plays in the protection of children.

Commission staff has addressed the following specific elements related to Y2K readiness:

- **Hardware/Software Remediation.** As of January 1999, the Commission had successfully remediated and tested CAS, the Commission's mission-critical application and its resident server; the local area network infrastructure that supports CAS; and all desktop computers, printers, and software applications. With respect to the Y2K readiness of CAS, the Commission was one of the first state agencies to complete such a critical phase of the Y2K compliance process.
- **Facility Embedded Systems.** Some of the operational systems that were installed at the Commission's facility contained date-specific embedded chips that could be affected by the year 2000. In early 1999, staff identified these systems and notified the affected vendors or manufacturers that Y2K remediation and testing would need to be completed. As of August 1999, the Commission's facility embedded systems, including all telecommunication, building alarm, and fire-detection systems, have been certified as Y2K-ready.
- **Continuity Plan for Business (CPB).** To ensure the continuous delivery of essential services to the Commission and our stakeholders, a comprehensive business continuity plan was developed and submitted to the DOIT as required on September 1, 1999. The CPB examines each business unit of the Commission for potential Y2K failures, analyzes "workaround" solutions to minimize adverse consequences, and identifies resources to assure seamless business resumption.
- **Detailed Department Assessment (DDA).** At the direction of the DOIT, the Commission's Y2K readiness was assessed by a DOIT contractor, Data Dimensions, Inc. This assessment, which was completed in July 1999, indicated that the Commission did ". . . an exemplary job in preparing the Commission's mission critical systems for the century rollover."
- **High Level Assessment.** Another DOIT contractor, Logicon Advanced Technology, subsequently conducted a second, "high level" assessment of the Commission's Y2K readiness. The outcome of this assessment, which is detailed in a Statewide Enterprise Assessment Team (SEAT) Report published in September 1999, indicated overall agreement with the DDA's conclusion that no major issues exist nor are any action items required to ensure that the Commission's systems are Y2K-ready. The SEAT Report also indicated that the Commission should prepare additional testing-related



documentation to validate more fully the Y2K readiness of its automated systems. This documentation will be prepared and is expected to be submitted to the DOIT by late October 1999.

Commission's staff has also completed additional Y2K preparedness work that includes a detailed comprehensive plan for managing any emergency that might result from the transition from the year 1999 to the year 2000.

The DOIT has reviewed all of the Commission's efforts to achieve Y2K readiness and has determined that the Commission has complied with all of the DOIT's requirements.



| [Back to the Top](#) |

| [Back to November 1999 Agenda](#)

| [Return to "Agenda Archives"](#) |

| [Return to "About CTC"](#) |





# California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

**Meeting of:** November 3-4, 1999

**Agenda Item Number:** PREP-1

**Committee:** Preparation Standards

**Title:** Approval of Subject Matter Preparation Programs by Colleges and Universities and Accelerated Approval of Professional Preparation Programs

✓ **Action**

**Prepared by:** Larry Birch, Ed.D., Administrator  
Professional Services Division

---

## Approval of Subject Matter Preparation Programs by Colleges and Universities and Accelerated Approval of Professional Preparation Programs

Professional Services Division  
October 18, 1999

### Executive Summary

This item contains a listing of subject matter programs recommended for approval by the appropriate review panels, according to procedures adopted by the Commission. The item also contains a listing of professional preparation programs recommended for accelerated approval by the Commission.

### Fiscal Impact Summary

The Professional Services Division is responsible for reviewing proposed preparation programs, consulting with external reviewers, as needed, and communicating with institutions and local education agencies about their program proposals. The Commission budget supports the costs of these activities. No augmentation of the budget will be needed for continuation of the program review and approval activities.

### Recommendation

That the Commission approve the subject matter preparation programs recommended in this item and that the Commission grant accelerated approval to the professional preparation program recommended in this item.

### Background

Subject Matter Program Review Panels are responsible for the review of proposed subject matter preparation programs. This item contains a listing of subject matter programs recommended for approval since the last Commission meeting by the appropriate review panels, according to procedures adopted by the Commission. In addition, an accelerated internship program is recommended for approval by staff according to procedures approved by the Commission.

### A. Summary Information on Single Subject Matter Preparation Programs Awaiting

## Commission Approval

For the following proposed preparation programs, each institution has responded fully to the Commission's standards and preconditions for subject matter preparation for Single Subject Teaching Credentials. Each of the programs has been reviewed thoroughly by the Commission's Subject Matter Program Review Panels. The panels have determined that each program has met all applicable standards and preconditions established by the Commission and they are now recommended for approval.

### Recommendation

That the Commission approve the following programs of subject matter preparation for Single Subject Teaching Credentials.

Art

- California State University, Chico

Music

- California State University, Fresno

Social Science

- California State University, Dominguez Hills

### B. Accelerated Approval of Internship Programs

As part of the Class-Size Reduction Initiative, the Professional Services Division is responsible for the accelerated approval of new internship programs for intern teachers in grades K-3. The following program has been submitted under the provisions made for the declaration of intent to provide a complete program proposal within six months of the date of approval. Staff recommends approval of the following program:

Chapman University - Multiple Subject CLAD Emphasis Internship Credential.



| [Back to the Top](#) |  
| [Back to November 1999 Agenda](#)  
| [Return to "Agenda Archives"](#) |  
| [Return to "About CTC"](#) |





# California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

**Meeting of:** November 3-4, 1999

**Agenda Item Number:** PREP-2

**Committee:** Preparation Standards

**Title:** Recommendations Related to Requirements for the Pupil Personnel Credential in School Psychology

✓ Action

**Prepared by:** Joe Dear, Ph.D., Consultant  
Professional Services Division

---

## Recommendations Related to Requirements for the Pupil Personnel Credential in School Psychology

Professional Services Division  
October 18, 1999

### Overview of this Report

Proposed legislation by Assemblyman George House, AB 707, is being considered that would require the Commission to establish a master's degree and specified hours of clinical experience for the school psychology credential. In this report the staff examines the implications of the legislation in light of the work being done by the Commission's Pupil Personnel Advisory Panel and past actions of the Commission.

### Policy Issues to be Resolved

Should the Commission require a degree beyond that of a baccalaureate for a pupil personnel services credential in school psychology.

### Fiscal Impact Summary

There is no fiscal impact on the agency's budget contained in this agenda report.

### Recommendation

That the Commission support legislative proposals that would require a master's or higher degree and a minimum of 1200 hours of supervised internship as partial requirements for the school psychologist credential.

## Background

In 1996, the Legislature through AB 3188 (House) directed the Commission "to consider adopting regulations to enhance the requirements of candidates for a school psychologist credential..." by re-examining the field experience standards for this credential. One purpose of the legislation was to determine if California should adopt the field experience standards of the national association of school psychologists that exceeded those required in Commission-approved programs. To respond to the Legislature, the Commission appointed a task force of practicing school psychologists and psychology professors to develop recommendations for the Commission's consideration. The work of the task force was eventually absorbed in the comprehensive review of the standards for all pupil personnel services credential programs approved by the Commission in March 1998.

During the recently completed legislative session, Assemblyman George House introduced AB 707 that again focuses on the preparation of school psychologists. This bill, which was passed the Assembly but was held in the Senate Education Committee for consideration in 2000, proposes to establish specific minimum requirements for school psychologists. These include two major changes that would be favorably received by the Pupil Personnel Advisory Panel: a significant increase in the hours of field experience required and a graduate degree in the field.

Senator Alpert and Assemblyman House agreed to hold AB 707 over to the second year of the legislative session to give the Commission's advisory panel an opportunity to complete its review of program standards and address the specific requirements for the school psychology credential. Although the panel has worked diligently at many meetings to complete its work, it will not do so by the necessary deadlines of the Legislature. The purpose of this agenda report is to request that the Commission consider endorsing the provisions of AB 707 that extend field experience and require the credential holder to earn a graduate degree in the field of school psychology.

## **Issues for Consideration**

### **Fieldwork Experience:**

The existing standards of the Commission to which school psychology programs are held require a minimum of 540 clock hours of field experience. Of these hours, 380 must be in school settings in direct contact with pupils. This requirement is well below that of the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) which calls for programs to have 1200 hours of a supervised internship.

Although the Commission's Pupil Personnel Advisory Panel has not completed its work, it has developed draft standards for the school psychologist specialization. The Panel will propose that new programs include 450 clock hours in a supervised practicum including 300 of those hours in a school setting in direct contact with pupils. Additionally, the Panel proposes an intern standard consistent with that of NASP, 1200 clock hours under the supervision of a credentialed school psychologist. In its preliminary draft standard, the Panel would require that the internship be completed within two years and that 800 of the clock hours be in a school setting in direct contact with pupils. All candidates for the school psychology credential would be required to complete both the practicum and the internship.

### **Graduate Degree**

The California Code of Regulations, Title 5, Section 80632, requires preparation programs for the school psychologist credential to consist of 60 semester or 90 quarter units of graduate study. Although the length of the program is comparable to most master's degree studies, the Commission does not require that the credential candidate earn the degree. Many credential applicants, if not most, from such programs earn the graduate degree.

Throughout its history, the Commission has made a distinction between a program for state certification and a program of study for an advanced degree. Only one time in its history has the Commission accepted a master's degree in lieu of a credential program; that was in the field of social work. That practice was abandoned in 1991 when program standards were adopted for all of the pupil personnel specialties including social work.

The only credential issued by the Commission for which an advanced degree is a requirement is the Clinical or Rehabilitative Services. In this case, unlike that of social work, the master's degree is not in lieu of a program of preparation, but is an additional requirement for the credential. The Commission made this decision to bring the state standards for the credential into conformity with the national organization's standards. The situation for Clinical or Rehabilitative Services and school psychology credential candidates is similar in that both require extensive graduate study and result in the earning of a credential and, in most cases, the awarding of the graduate degree.

A decision by the Commission to require a graduate degree for the school psychologist would bring California into conformity with the requirements established by the National Association of School Psychologists. Staff believes that such a requirement would be received positively by the profession within the state. It must be made clear, however, that the graduate degree does not replace the requirement that the credential candidate complete a professional preparation program.

## Recommendation

AB 707 by Assemblyman George House contains the provisions discussed above. Passage of the legislation would compliment the work of the Pupil Personnel Advisory Panel and could clarify the authority of the Commission to require the graduate degree. There are other provisions in the proposed legislation that may need modification. The author has given assurances that he will work with the Commission to address any concerns that might remain.

Staff proposes that the Commission support legislation that would establish a supervised internship of a minimum of 1200 clock hours and a graduate degree as partial requirements for the school psychology credential.



| [Back to the Top](#) |

| [Back to November 1999 Agenda](#)

| [Return to "Agenda Archives"](#) |

| [Return to "About CTC"](#) |





## California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

**Meeting of:** November 3-4, 1999

**Agenda Item Number:** PREP-3

**Committee:** Preparation Standards

**Title:** Recommendations Related to the Reciprocity Study Under AB 1620

✓ Action

**Prepared by:** Philip Fitch, Ed.D., Consultant; Jim Alford, Analyst; Darya Callihan, Analyst; Sara Swan, Analyst  
Professional Services Division

### Summary of an Agenda Report

#### Recommendations Related to the Reciprocity Study Under AB 1620

Professional Services Division  
October 19, 1999

#### Executive Summary - Overview

This AB 1620 agenda item provides the Commissioners with a fifth report regarding activities and recommendations of the AB 1620 Task Force which last met on September 28-29 and October 14-15, 1999. At its last two meetings, the Task Force reviewed standards and guidelines for a number of additional states. Forty-four (44) states were reviewed for their accreditation and program approval procedures; thirty-nine (39) states were reviewed in the areas of preparation of elementary and secondary teachers; and thirty-three (33) states were reviewed in the areas of preparation of special education teachers. **A set of recommendations for action by the Commission is included in this agenda item.**

AB 1620, sponsored by the Commission in 1998, was passed by the legislature without a single "no" vote and signed by then Governor Wilson as urgency legislation in August 1998. This agenda item refers to only two sections of the eight sections of AB 1620, specifically Sections 1 and 8. Plans for implementing Sections 2 through 7 were presented to the Commission at its November 1998 meeting.

Section 1 of AB 1620 (EC§44274) requires the Commission to conduct periodic reviews, beginning in 1998, to determine whether any state has established teacher preparation standards that are at least comparable and equivalent to teacher preparation standards in California, and to initiate negotiations with these states to provide reciprocity in teacher credentialing. If this determination is made, Section 1 of the bill requires the Commission to issue an equivalent teaching credential, permit or certificate to an applicant holding or qualifying for a teaching credential, permit or certificate awarded by a state that has entered into a reciprocity agreement with the Commission. Section 1 of AB 1620 requires the Commission to grant an appropriate credential to any applicant from another state who has completed teacher preparation equivalent to teacher preparation standards in California, whether a reciprocity agreement with other states is pending completion or the other state has declined to enter into a reciprocity agreement with California. The bill also requires the Commission to issue a five-year preliminary specialist instruction credential authorizing instruction of pupils with disabilities to an applicant who holds or qualifies for a valid special education credential from another state that has special education standards determined by the Commission to be equivalent and comparable to California's standards.

During September and October, 1998 members of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) reciprocity management team met to determine ways to obtain standards and procedural documents from other states and to determine the extent to which other states' standards and procedures were both comparable and equivalent. In November, letters of request for information were sent to the other forty-nine states by the Executive Director. Also, letters were sent to selected out-of-state universities that were identified by other state Departments of Education, Commissions or Professional Boards. To date material has been received from forty-four other states and from several out-of-state universities and colleges. A nineteen-member Reciprocity Task Force was formed in November, 1998 to identify procedures for determining equivalency and comparability of other states' standards, guidelines and procedures for preparing elementary, secondary and special education teachers. The Task Force met eight times for two days in January, February, March, April, May, June, September, and October, 1999 to develop and implement

procedures for determining comparability.

### **Policy Issues to be Resolved**

The following policy questions are addressed in this agenda item:

- Are there other states that have equivalent and comparable standards and procedures for the preparation, credentialing and licensing of elementary, secondary and special education teachers?
- Are there other states that have program approval, accreditation or quality assurance procedures and policies that are comparable and equivalent to those of California?
- Are there other states that have developed and require basic skills tests and subject-matter requirements that are equivalent and comparable to those of California?
- Are there other states that wish to enter into a reciprocity agreement with California?

### **Relationship to the Commission's Strategic Goals and Objectives**

#### **Goals:**

- Promote educational excellence in California schools.
- Take a leadership role in recruiting and preparing qualified teachers in response to class size reductions.
- Consider options including internships, waivers, emergency permits, apprenticeships, and certifications to meet the needs of California classrooms.

### **Fiscal Impact Statement**

AB 1620 appropriated \$90,000 from the Teacher Credentials Fund for the 1998-99 fiscal year for expenditure by the Commission for the purpose of conducting a review to determine whether any state has established teacher preparation standards that meet or exceed California standards. Staff believes that these funds are sufficient to complete the initial reciprocity study but will not be sufficient to cover the on-going activities necessary to maintain reciprocity agreements with other states.

### **Staff Recommendations**

There are two staff recommendations for this agenda item:

#### **1. September and October Task Force Recommendations**

That the Commission approve the recommendations of the AB 1620 Reciprocity Task Force related to findings of comparability in accreditation and program standards for teacher preparation and preparation of special educators in selected states reviewed at the September 28-29 and October 14-15, 1999 Task Force meetings.

#### **2. Subject Matter Comparability**

That the Commission approve the preliminary findings and recommendations of the subject-matter comparability study in four credential subject areas: English, mathematics, multiple subjects (elementary education), and social science.

## **Part I: Recommendations of the Task Force from the September and October 1999 Meetings**

### **Background**

For more than two decades the Commission has considered the issue of credential reciprocity. To this end it has participated in a variety of activities to interact with other states to develop agreements that might allow the Commission to accept candidates prepared by accredited out-of-state institutions approved by their state's department of education, commission or board. However, specific requirements in various states have created difficulties for teachers prepared in one state who seek certification in another state. Interstate agreements in past years have been limited in scope, and have ensured little, if any, credential reciprocity between the participating states. For instance, the Commission has signed with 39 other states as a member of the NASDTEC Interstate Compact. For many states this compact is primarily an agreement to work together and does not provide for specific reciprocal agreements for teacher credentialing and licensure. In fact, credential reciprocity has not been reachable in California under any prior or current interstate agreement.

In sponsoring AB 1620, the Commission has taken a major step in establishing reciprocity with other states. This legislation permits the Commission to enter into reciprocal agreements with those states that are determined to have comparable and equivalent teacher preparation standards to those required for teachers prepared in California. The law provides:

*(a) The commission shall conduct periodic reviews, beginning in 1998, to determine whether any state has established teacher preparation standards that are at least comparable and equivalent to teacher preparation standards in California.*

*(b) When the commission determines, pursuant to subdivision (a), that the teacher preparation standards established by any state are at least comparable and equivalent to teacher preparation standards in California, the commission shall*



AB 1620 established Sections 44274, 44274.2, 44274.4, and 44274.5, introducing several provisions related to the California certification of teachers prepared in other states. At its November 1998 meeting, staff presented a plan for implementing elements of the law that apply to teachers with three to five years of teaching experience. The Commissioners approved this plan, staff has implemented the plan, and the Commission is now able to grant credentials to those teachers who verify that they meet the requirements established for experienced teachers in these sections.

Section 44274 relates to the pursuit of credential reciprocity agreements with those states determined by the Commission to have teacher preparation standards comparable to those in California. Specifically, EC§44274(a) and (b) require the Commission to conduct periodic reviews of other states' teacher preparation standards. Subsection (c) requires the Commission to grant to a teacher prepared in another state with comparable standards an equivalent California credential. The California credential is to be issued regardless of whether a credential reciprocity agreement is established or pending, or the other state declines to enter into a credential reciprocity agreement with California.

In November 1998, letters were sent to the other 49 states from the Executive Director to inform them of the Scott legislation and to request their assistance in the reciprocity study. More recently the staff has also requested materials for the District of Columbia. The following materials were requested:

- materials relating to the specific certification requirements for teaching in early childhood education, elementary education, middle school or junior high school education, high school and special education;
- materials relating to their state's requirements for verifying knowledge of the subject curricula to be taught at elementary and secondary levels;
- materials relating to the state standards or guidelines that are required by their state for universities and colleges to develop professional preparation programs for elementary, secondary and special education teachers; and
- materials that are used by their state agency for conducting program reviews on accreditation visits, such as materials relating to procedures for site visits, team member composition, and frequency of visits.

To date, forty-four states have responded to this request and the Reciprocity Task Force has been able to review and analyze these materials at the January, February, March, April, May, June, September, and October 1999 meetings of the Task Force. In a number of cases, Commission staff has needed to follow up with specific requests for other material or to obtain clarification on the material that was under review by the Task Force.

### **AB 1620 Reciprocity Task Force**

In November, 1998, a nineteen-member Reciprocity Task Force was created to develop processes for determining the equivalency and comparability of other states' standards and program review or accreditation procedures. Task Force members were identified by Commission consultants who have responsibility for the special education panel, accreditation teams, and standard-setting panels. Individuals were identified who have extensive professional experience and expertise in the standards areas being analyzed and reviewed. The Commission's procedures, as stated in the Policy Manual, were followed to ensure gender, ethnic, racial and geographic balance in K-12 schools and in higher education. Most importantly, the individuals involved needed to have a professional reputation for being able to make holistic, qualitative professional judgments regarding the comparability of standards.

The task force identified herein was charged with conducting the review of other states' teacher preparation standards, and recommending states for recognition as having comparable standards based upon this review.

Further, given that Section 44274(c) calls for granting an equivalent California credential to the credential earned in the other state, the Task Force will recommend the appropriate level of credential (preliminary or professional clear) to be granted to an individual from an approved state based upon the level of preparation they are required to complete by that state's standards.

The Task Force has been divided into three working groups or teams:

- Accreditation and Common Standards Team
- Elementary and Secondary Standards Team
- Special Education Standards Team

The membership of the three teams is listed below.

#### **Accreditation and Common Standards Team**

Dr. Phyllis Fernlund, Dean, School of Education, Sonoma State University

Dr. Irving Hendrick, Former Dean, School of Education, UC Riverside

Dr. Jim Scott, Superintendent of Schools, Eureka Public Schools

Dr. Alice Watkins, Dean, School of Education, Azusa Pacific University

Dr. Lamar Mayer, Past Associate Dean, School of Education, CSU Los Angeles

#### **Elementary and Secondary Standards Team**

Dr. Linda Childress, BTSA Director, Inland Empire, Riverside County Office of Education

Dr. Jacob Perea, Dean, College of Education, San Francisco State University

Mr. Hank Richardson, Assistant Superintendent Personnel, Hesperia Unified School District

Dr. Joan Rossi, Department of Education, College of Notre Dame

Ms. Linda Strom, Director, Certificated Personnel, Elk Grove Unified School District

Ms. Kathy Walker, Director of Curriculum and Instruction, Bakersfield City Schools

### **Special Education Standards Team**

Ms. Sue Craig, Resource Specialist, Mild/Moderate, Red Bluff Union High School

Dr. Robert Jordan, Director, Special Education, San Diego County Office of Education

Dr. Noma LeMoine, Director, Specialized Programs, Los Angeles Unified School District

Dr. Terry Saenz, Department of Speech Communication, CSU Fullerton

Dr. Karl Skindrud, School of Education, Department of Special Education, California State University, Dominguez Hills

Examples of the various matrices used by the teams are presented in Appendix A of this agenda item. Team members are prepared to discuss the procedures used to analyze each set of state standards, standard by standard, to determine qualitatively and holistically that other states' standards are equivalent and comparable.

Following are some of the operational procedures that were agreed to by the members of the Task Force.

### **Task Force Norms/Agreed Upon Procedures**

- Task Force will make recommendations either for preliminary or professional clear credentials based on each state's standards.
- Task Force will recommend or deny elementary or secondary or special education comparability independently.
- Special Education Authorizations will be recommended individually specifically by credential area.
- Task Force will review state documents first to determine comparability, then use institutional documents if necessary.
- Task Force members will identify other information needed for making comparability decisions.
- Task Force teams will provide CCTC Staff with a final statement of decisions they reach.
- The Accreditation Team will review state documents for the eight Common Standards as well as accreditation process comparability and report their findings to other teams.
- The decisions of the Accreditation and Common Standards Team are prerequisites to determining comparability in special education, elementary and secondary teaching.
- The Accreditation and Common Standards Team will determine which states the other teams will review.

As stated earlier in this item, the Reciprocity Task Force has met for two days in January, February, March, April, May, June, September, and October, 1999. The Task Force will also meet on November 18-19 at the Country Suites Hotel in Ontario. Commissioners or public members interested in observing the work of the Task Force at the November meeting are welcome to attend all or any part of the two-day meeting.

### **Task Force Recommendations from September and October, 1999**

**The Commission Staff and the AB 1620 Task Force recommend that the Commission approve the following decisions of the Task Force related to program accreditation procedures, elementary and secondary teacher preparation programs, and special education teacher preparation programs in states reviewed to date:**

State	Task Force Decision
1. Alabama	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Elementary and secondary standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.</li></ul>
2. Delaware	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Elementary and secondary standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.</li><li>• The special education areas of Mild to Moderate and Visual Impairments were found to be equivalent and comparable for the Preliminary Level I Credential.</li><li>• The special education areas of Speech, Language and Hearing, and Audiology were found to be equivalent and comparable for the clear credential.</li></ul>
3. Florida	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.</li></ul>

	The special education areas of Mild to Moderate and Moderate to Severe were found to be equivalent and comparable for the Preliminary Level I Credential.
5. Illinois	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Elementary and secondary standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.</li> </ul>
6. Kansas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Elementary and secondary standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.</li> </ul>
7. Kentucky	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The special education areas of Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, and Visual Impairments were found to be equivalent and comparable for the Preliminary Level I Credential.</li> </ul>
8. Maine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The special education area of Early Childhood Special Ed was found to be equivalent and comparable for the Preliminary Level I Credential.</li> <li>The special education area of Language, Speech, and Hearing was found to be equivalent and comparable for the clear credential.</li> </ul>
9. Maryland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The special education areas of Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Visual Impairments, and Early Childhood Special Ed were found to be equivalent and comparable for the Preliminary Level I Credential.</li> </ul>
10. Massachusetts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.</li> </ul>
11. New Hampshire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.</li> <li>The special education areas of Mild to Moderate (if includes Behavior Disorders and Learning Disabled Endorsements), and Deaf and Hard of Hearing were found to be equivalent and comparable for the Preliminary Level I Credential.</li> </ul>
12. New Mexico	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The special education area of Mild to Moderate was found to be equivalent and comparable for the Preliminary Level I Credential.</li> </ul>
13. South Carolina	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Elementary and secondary standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.</li> </ul>
14. Virginia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Elementary and secondary standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.</li> <li>The special education areas of Mild to Moderate (with both ED and LD authorizations), Moderate to Severe (with both MR and SD authorizations), Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Visual Impairments, and Early Childhood Special Ed were found to be equivalent and comparable for the Preliminary Level I Credential.</li> <li>The special education area of Language, Speech and Hearing (with Masters Degree) was found to be equivalent and comparable for the clear credential.</li> </ul>
15. Wisconsin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Elementary and secondary standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.</li> <li>The special education areas of Mild to Moderate (if have learning disabled and emotionally disturbed authorizations), Moderate to Severe (if have cognitive disability and emotionally disturbed authorizations), deaf and hard of hearing, and Early Childhood Special Ed were found to be equivalent and comparable for the Preliminary Level I Credential.</li> <li>The special education area of Language, Speech and Hearing (with Masters Degree) was found to be equivalent and comparable for the clear credential.</li> </ul>
16. Wyoming	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Elementary and secondary standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.</li> <li>The special education areas of Mild to Moderate, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Visual Impairments, and Early Childhood Special Ed were found to be equivalent and comparable for the Preliminary Level I Credential.</li> <li>The special education areas of Speech, Language and Hearing, and Audiology were found to be equivalent and comparable for the clear credential.</li> </ul>
As the Task Force continues to meet, staff and representatives of the Task Force will bring updates and further recommendations to the Commission for its consideration and action.	

#### Previous Action of the Commission

At its March 3-4, April 14-15, May 5-6, and July 7-8, 1999 meetings the Commission approved the following states as having comparable standards and accreditation procedures on the recommendation of the AB 1620 Task Force.

State	Task Force Decision
1. Alabama	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.</li> </ul>

	<p>The special education areas of Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Physical and Health Impairments, Visual Impairments, and Early Childhood Special Ed were found to be equivalent and comparable for the Preliminary Level I Credential.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The special education area of Language, Speech and Hearing with proof of Masters Degree was found to be comparable and equivalent for the clear credential.</li> </ul>
2. Arizona	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.</li> <li>• Elementary and secondary standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.</li> </ul>
3. Arkansas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.</li> </ul>
4. Colorado	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.</li> <li>• Elementary and secondary standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.</li> <li>• The special education areas of Mild to Moderate (with endorsements in moderate and affective disabilities), Moderate to Severe (with endorsements in moderate and affective or severe and affective), Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Physical and Health Impairments, Visual Impairments, Early Childhood Special Ed, and Orientation and Mobility were found to be comparable and equivalent for the Preliminary Level I Credential.</li> <li>• The special education areas of Language, Speech and Hearing, Audiology, and Special Class Authorization were found to be equivalent and comparable for the clear credential.</li> </ul>
5. Delaware	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.</li> </ul>
6. Georgia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.</li> <li>• Elementary and secondary standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.</li> <li>• The special education areas of Mild to Moderate, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Visual Impairments, and Physical and Health Impairments were found to be equivalent and comparable for the Preliminary Level I Credential.</li> </ul>
7. Hawaii	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.</li> </ul>
8. Illinois	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.</li> </ul>
9. Idaho	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.</li> </ul>
10. Indiana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.</li> </ul>
11. Kansas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.</li> <li>• The special education areas of Language, Speech, and Hearing, and Audiology were found to be equivalent and comparable.</li> </ul>
12. Kentucky	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.</li> </ul>
13. Louisiana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.</li> <li>• The special education areas of Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Visual Impairments, and Early Childhood Special Ed were found to be equivalent and comparable for the Preliminary Level I Credential.</li> </ul>
14. Maine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.</li> <li>• Elementary and secondary standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.</li> </ul>
15. Maryland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.</li> <li>• Elementary and secondary standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.</li> </ul>

	<p>Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Elementary and secondary standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.</li> <li>• The special education areas of Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Physical and Health Impairments, and Visual Impairments were found to be equivalent and comparable for the Preliminary Level I Credential.</li> <li>• The special education area of Language, Speech and Hearing was found to be equivalent and comparable for the clear credential.</li> </ul>
17. Montana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.</li> <li>• The special education area of Mild to Moderate was found to be equivalent and comparable for the Preliminary Level I Credential.</li> </ul>
18. Nebraska	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.</li> <li>• Elementary and secondary standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.</li> <li>• The special education areas of Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, Deaf and Hard of Hearing (pre K-12) or (K-9) or (pre K-3 and 7-12), Visual Impairments, Early Childhood Special Ed, and Speech Language Pathology (not Speech Language Technician) were found to be equivalent and comparable for the Preliminary Level 1 Credential.</li> </ul>
19. New Mexico	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.</li> </ul>
20. North Carolina	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.</li> <li>• Elementary and secondary standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.</li> <li>• The special education areas of Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Visual Impairments, and Early Childhood Special Ed were found to be equivalent and comparable for the Preliminary Level I Credential.</li> <li>• The special education areas of Language, Speech and Hearing, and Audiology were found to be equivalent and comparable for the clear credential.</li> <li>• The special education area of Mild to Moderate (masters degree and license in specific learning disabilities and license in behavioral disorders) was found to be equivalent and comparable for the Level II credential.</li> </ul>
21. North Dakota	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.</li> </ul>
22. Oklahoma	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.</li> </ul>
23. Oregon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.</li> <li>• The special education areas of Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, Visual Impairments, and Deaf and Hard of Hearing were found to be equivalent and comparable for the Preliminary Level I Credential.</li> <li>• The special education area of Language, Speech and Hearing was found to be equivalent and comparable for the clear credential.</li> </ul>
24. Pennsylvania	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.</li> <li>• The special education areas of Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, and Visual Impairments were found to be equivalent and comparable for the Preliminary Level I Credential.</li> <li>• The special education area of Language, Speech and Hearing (with masters degree) was found to be equivalent and comparable for the clear credential.</li> </ul>
25. Rhode Island	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.</li> <li>• Elementary and secondary standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.</li> <li>• The special education areas of Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Visually Impaired, and Early Childhood Ed (comparable with Early Childhood and Special Ed authorization) were found to be equivalent and comparable for the Preliminary Level 1 Credential.</li> <li>• The special education areas of Language, Speech and Hearing, and Audiology were found to be equivalent and comparable for the clear credential.</li> </ul>
26. South Carolina	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.</li> </ul>
27. Tennessee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and</li> </ul>

	comparable. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Elementary and secondary standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.</li> <li>The special education areas of Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Physical and Health Impairments, Visual Impairments, and Early Childhood Special Ed were found to be equivalent and comparable for the Preliminary Level I Credential.</li> <li>The special education area of Language, Speech and Hearing was found to be equivalent and comparable for the clear credential.</li> </ul>
28. Utah	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.</li> <li>Elementary and secondary standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.</li> <li>The special education areas of Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Visual Impairments, and Early Childhood Special Ed were found to be equivalent and comparable for the Preliminary Level I Credential.</li> </ul>
29. Virginia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.</li> </ul>
30. Washington	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.</li> <li>Elementary and secondary standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.</li> <li>The special education areas of audiology and speech pathology were found to be comparable.</li> </ul>
31. Wisconsin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.</li> </ul>
32. Wyoming	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.</li> </ul>

### State Review Status

To date, forty-four (44) sets of other state standards have been reviewed by members of the Task Force. The Following charts provide the Commission with the status of each state review.

Accreditation/Common Standards Team	
44 States Reviewed	35-Comparable
	5-Not Comparable
	1-Decision Pending Approval of Draft Revised Standards
	1-Decision Pending Additional Information
	2-Need More Information
Elementary and Secondary Standards Team	
39 States Reviewed	20-Comparable
	5-Accreditation Not Comparable
	14-Need More Information
5 States Yet to be Reviewed	
Special Education Standards Team	
33 States Reviewed	25-Comparable in Select Areas
	2-Not Comparable
	5-Accreditation Not Comparable
	8-Need More Information
4 States Yet to be Reviewed	

# AB 1620 - Reciprocity Study

## Task Force Decisions as of September 28-29 and October 14-15, 1999

State	Standards for Elementary & Secondary Teacher Preparation	Comparable or not Comparable	Standards for Special Education	Comparable or not Comparable	Standards for Program Review or Accreditation	Comparable or not Comparable
<b>1. Maryland</b>	UM - Elementary and Secondary Program  NCATE Standards  INTASC Standards  Professional Development School	Elementary Standards Comparable  Secondary Standards Comparable	National Council for Exceptional Children Standards	Comparable in the following areas for the Preliminary Level I Credential: Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Visual Impairments, and Early Childhood Special Ed	Program Approval Manual  NCATE - Initial and Continuing  Professional Development School	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
<b>2. Kentucky</b>	NCATE  INTASC  State Standards  Northern Kentucky University: Folio - Elementary Education Grades P-5 Appendix A - Conceptual Framework Course Syllabus  New and Experienced Teacher Standards	Need more information	Council for Exceptional Children  New and Experienced Teacher Standards	Comparable in the following areas for the Preliminary Level I Credential: Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, and Visual Impairments	NCATE  INTASC Education Professional Standards Board	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
<b>3. Kansas</b>	NCATE Standards  State Standards for Elementary and Secondary Teachers  Kansas State University -- NCATE institutional report and program materials  University of Kansas Program Materials	Elementary Standards Comparable  Secondary Standards Comparable	Special Education Standards	Comparable in the following credential areas: Language, Speech, and Hearing, and Audiology	Accredited Institutions  NCATE Standards  Instructional Handbook for Program Approval  Accreditation	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
<b>4. Colorado</b>	Knowledge of Content and Learning  INTASC Standards	Elementary Standards Comparable  Secondary Standards Comparable	Special Education Endorsements	Comparable in the following areas for the Preliminary Level I Credential: Mild to Moderate (with endorsements in moderate and affective disabilities), Moderate to Severe (with endorsements in moderate and affective or severe and affective), Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Physical and Health Impairments, Visual Impairments, Early Childhood Special Ed, and Orientation and Mobility  Comparable in the following areas for the clear credential: Language, Speech and Hearing, Audiology, and Special Class Authorization	Professional Education Approval  NCATE Standards  INTASC Standards	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable

5. Alabama	Teacher Education Standards	Elementary Standards Comparable	Special Education	Comparable in the following areas for the Preliminary Level I Credential: Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Physical and Health Impairments, Visual Impairments, and Early Childhood Special Ed	NCATE and State Standards	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
	INTASC Standards	Secondary Standards Comparable				
	NCATE Standards					
	Draft Teacher Education Program Standards					
	University of North Alabama - Course Syllabi					
	Samford University - Course Syllabi					
6. Nebraska	Elementary Standards	Elementary Standards Comparable	Special Education Standards	Comparable in the following areas for the Preliminary Level I Credential: Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, Deaf and Hard of Hearing (pre K-12) or (K-9) or (pre K-3 and 7-12), Visual Impairments, Early Childhood Special Ed, and Speech Language Pathology (not Speech Language Technician)	NCATE Standards	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
	Secondary Standards	Secondary Standards Comparable			University of Nebraska	
	NCATE Standards				Approved Colleges  Council On Teacher Education Policies	
7. Tennessee	General Education Elementary Professional Education	Elementary Standards Comparable	General Education  Professional Education  Elementary  Secondary  Special Education Standards	Comparable in the following areas for the Preliminary Level I Credential: Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Physical and Health Impairments, Visual Impairments, and Early Childhood Special Ed  Comparable in the following area for the clear credential: Language, Speech and Hearing	Professional Education	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
	General Education Secondary Professional Education	Secondary Standards Comparable			Program Approval Standards	
	Program Approval Standards	NCATE Standards			NCATE Standards	
	NCATE Standards					
8. Rhode Island	Requirements for Early Childhood, Elementary	Elementary Standards Comparable	Requirements for Early Childhood Special Ed.	Comparable in the following areas for the Preliminary Level I Credential: Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Visually Impaired, and Early Childhood Ed (comparable with Early Childhood and Special Ed authorization)  Comparable in the following areas for the clear credential: Language, Speech and Hearing, and Audiology	Program Approval Standards	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
	Middle School, Secondary	Secondary Standards Comparable	Elementary and Middle School Special Ed.		Commissioner's Standards for the Approval of Teacher Education Programs	
	Beginning Teacher Standards		Secondary Special Ed., Severe and Profound		NCATE Standards	
	Commissioner's Standards		Commissioner's Standards			
	NCATE Standards					
9. North Carolina	Teacher Education Program	Elementary Standards Comparable	Teacher Education Program	Comparable in the following areas for the Preliminary Level I Credential: Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Visual Impairments, and Early Childhood Special Ed  Comparable in the	Teacher Education Program	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
	Professional Studies	Secondary Standards Comparable	Special Education Standards		Professional Studies	
	Licensure for Public Schools		Licensure for Public Schools		Standards for the Approval of Teacher Education Institute	
	NCATE Standards				NCATE Standards	



			Program Directory	following areas for the clear credential: Language, Speech and Hearing, and Audiology  Comparable in the following area for the Level II credential: Mild to Moderate (masters degree and license in specific learning disabilities and license in behavioral disorders)	Program Directory	
<b>10. Washington</b>	Approval Standards for Performance Board  NCATE Standards  INTASC Standards  Approved Program and Certification Guidelines  Endorsements for Teacher Certificates  Guidelines for Approval of Professional Education Programs  Approved Program Directory	Elementary Standards Comparable  Secondary Standards Comparable	Approval Standards for Performance Board  NCATE Standards  Approved Program and Certification Guidelines  Endorsements for Teacher Certificates  Guidelines for Approval of Professional Education Programs  Approved Program Directory	Comparable in the following credential areas: Language, Speech and Hearing, and Audiology	Approval Standards for Performance Board  NCATE Standards  Approved Program and Certification Guidelines  Endorsements for Teacher Certificates  Guidelines for Approval of Professional Education Programs  Approved Program Directory	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
<b>11. New Jersey</b>	Standards for Teacher Education Programs  Indicators of Compliance and Quality  NASDTEC Standards	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Not Comparable	Standards for Teacher Education Programs  Indicators of Compliance and Quality  NASDTEC Standards  Need Special Ed Standards	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Not Comparable	Standards for Teacher Education Programs  Indicators of Compliance and Quality  NASDTEC Standards	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Not Comparable
<b>12. Utah</b>	Teacher Education Programs  Certification Requirements  Certification Standards  Utah State Core Reading - Grades 4-6  NCATE Standards  NASDTEC Standards  Multicultural Education Standards - State Standards and State University Response	Elementary Standards Comparable  Secondary Standards Comparable	Certification Requirements  Certification Standards	Comparable in the following areas for the Preliminary Level I Credential: Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Visual Impairments, and Early Childhood Special Ed	Teacher Education Programs  Certification Requirements  Certification Standards  NCATE Standards  NASDTEC Standards	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
<b>13. Missouri</b>	Standards for Teacher Education Programs  Design of Professional Education	Elementary Standards Comparable  Secondary	Standards for Teacher Education Programs	Comparable in the following areas for the Preliminary Level I Credential: Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, Deaf and Hard	Standards for Teacher Education Programs  Design of Professional Education	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable

	Standards for School Leaders  Standards for Teacher Education Procedures for Program Review  Professional Education Programs Annual Report Form  Directory of Approved Professional Education Programs  Certification Requirements	Comparable	Professional Education  Standards for School Leaders  Standards for Teacher Education Procedures for Program Review  Professional Education Programs Annual Report Form  Special Education Certification Requirements  Special Education Subject Competencies	of Hearing, Physical and Health Impairments, and Visual Impairments  Comparable in the following area for the clear credential: Language, Speech and Hearing	Standards for School Leaders  Standards for Teacher Education Procedures for Program Review  Professional Education Programs Annual Report Form  Directory of Approved Professional Education Programs	
<b>14. Delaware</b>	Professional Teaching Standards  Regulations for the Approval of Teacher Education Programs  NASDTEC/NCATE Standards  Certification Requirements  University of Delaware - NCATE Report, Course Syllabi and Catalog	Elementary Standards Comparable  Secondary Standards Comparable	Professional Teaching Standards  Certification Requirements	Comparable in the following areas for the Preliminary Level I Credential: Mild to Moderate and Visual Impairments  Comparable in the following areas for the clear credential: Speech, Language and Hearing, and Audiology	Professional Teaching Standards  Regulations for the Approval of Teacher Education Programs  NASDTEC/NCATE Standards	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
<b>15. Montana</b>	Teacher Education Program Standards  Procedures Manual for Montana Teacher Education Standards	Need more information	Teacher Education Program Standards  Procedures Manual for Montana Teacher Education Standards	Comparable in the following area for the Preliminary Level I Credential: Mild to Moderate	Teacher Education Program Standards  Procedures Manual for Montana Teacher Education Standards	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
<b>16. Illinois</b>	Minimum Requirements for State Certificates  Preparing Educators for the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century - Draft Recommendations  Directory of Approved Teacher Preparation Programs  NCATE Standards  Illinois State University - course syllabi and catalogs  Wheaton College - excerpt from NCATE report and course syllabi	Elementary Standards Comparable  Secondary Standards Comparable	Minimum Requirements for State Certificates  Preparing Educators for the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century - Draft Recommendations  Directory of Approved Teacher Preparation Programs  Special Education Certification and Approval Requirements and Procedures	Special Education Standards Not Comparable	Minimum Requirements for State Certificates  Preparing Educators for the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century - Draft Recommendations  Directory of Approved Teacher Preparation Programs  Draft Regulations for Approval of Teacher Preparation Programs  NCATE Standards	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
<b>17. Arizona</b>	Professional Development Title 7. Education  Northern Arizona	Elementary Standards Comparable  Secondary	Professional Development Title 7. Education (pg. 12-17)	Special Education Standards Not Comparable	Professional Development Title 7. Education  Professional	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable

	University - Self-Study Report	Standards Comparable	Certification Requirements		Preparation Programs (pg. 7-8)	
<b>18. Minnesota</b>	Proposed Rules Governing Teacher Licensing	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Not Comparable	Proposed Rules Governing Teacher Licensing	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Not Comparable	Proposed Rules Governing Teacher Licensing  Program Approval Rules	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Not Comparable
<b>19. Georgia</b>	Standards for Professional Education Units and Programs  Handbook for Board of Examiners Teams  NCATE Standards	Elementary Standards Comparable  Secondary Standards Comparable	Standards for Professional Education Units and Programs  Handbook for Board of Examiners Teams  Speech and Language Pathology and Audiology Standards	Comparable in the following areas for the Preliminary Level I Credential: Mild to Moderate, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Visual Impairments, and Physical and Health Impairments	Standards for Professional Education Units and Programs  Handbook for Board of Examiners Teams  NCATE Standards	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
<b>20. Oregon</b>	Administrative Rules for On-Site Visits  Approved Teacher Education Programs  Continuing Professional Development for Licensure Renewal  Teacher Licensure for 21 <sup>st</sup> Century Schools  Preparing Quality Educators for 21 <sup>st</sup> Century Schools  Letter - Eastern Oregon University  Standards for Program Approval  Standards for Teacher Preparation Programs  Eastern Oregon University -- Teacher Education Document  George Fox University - Teacher Education Document	Need more information	Administrative Rules for On-Site Visits  Approved Teacher Education Programs  Continuing Professional Development for Licensure Renewal  Teacher Licensure for 21 <sup>st</sup> Century Schools  Preparing Quality Educators for 21 <sup>st</sup> Century Schools  Special Education Standards	Comparable in the following areas for the Preliminary Level I Credential: Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, Visual Impairments, and Deaf and Hard of Hearing  Comparable in the following area for the clear credential: Language, Speech and Hearing	Administrative Rules for On-Site Visits  Approved Teacher Education Programs  Continuing Professional Development for Licensure Renewal  Teacher Licensure for 21 <sup>st</sup> Century Schools  Preparing Quality Educators for 21 <sup>st</sup> Century Schools  Program Approval Site Visit Handbook	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
<b>21. Wyoming</b>	Professional Teaching Standards Board - General Provisions  Bilingual Education (pg. 49-50)  Program Standards (pg. 7-38)  NCATE Standards  University of Wyoming: Course Outlines	Elementary Standards Comparable  Secondary Standards Comparable	Professional Teaching Standards Board - General Provisions  Program Standards (pg. 38-44 and pg. 70-71)  NCATE Standards	Comparable in the following areas for the Preliminary Level I Credential: Mild to Moderate, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Visual Impairments, and Early Childhood Special Ed  Comparable in the following areas for the clear credential: Speech, Language and Hearing, and Audiology	Professional Teaching Standards Board - General Provisions  Program Standards (pg. 71-73)  NCATE Standards  Handbook for Professional Teaching Standards Board	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
<b>22. Arkansas</b>	NCATE Standards	Need more information	Special Education Guidelines	Need more information	NCATE only	Accreditation Procedures and

	INTASC Standards				INTASC Standards	Comparable
<b>23. Pennsylvania</b>	Standards and Policies (pg. 1-12)  Instructional Certificates (pg. 12-108)	Need more information	Special Education Standards and Policies (pg. 61-70)	Comparable in the following areas for the Preliminary Level I Credential: Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, and Visual Impairments  Comparable in the following area for the clear credential: Language, Speech and Hearing with masters degree	Administrative Procedures for Program Approval  NCATE Partnership State  General Standards (pg. 1-12)	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
<b>24. Maine</b>	Policies, Procedures and Standards  Eight Program Approval Standards (Chapter 114)  NCATE Standards (see Chart 1)  Section 2020  INTASC Standards	Elementary Standards Comparable  Secondary Standards Comparable	Special Education Competencies (Sections 9030, 8079, 2282, 6282, 8293)	Comparable in the following area for the Preliminary Level I Credential: Early Childhood Special Ed  Comparable in the following area for the clear credential: Language, Speech, and Hearing	Policies, Procedures and Standards  Eight Program Approval Standards (Chapter 114)  NCATE Partnership (see Chart 1)  INTASC Standards	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
<b>25. Louisiana</b>	Bulletin 996 - Standards for Program Approval  Bulletin 746 -- Policies and Procedures for Louisiana Teacher Assessment	Need more information	Bulletin 746 -- Policies and Procedures for Louisiana Teacher Assessment Part VII - Teachers of Exceptional Children	Comparable in the following areas for the Preliminary Level I Credential: Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Visual Impairments, and Early Childhood Special Ed	Bulletin 996 - Standards for Program Approval  NCATE Standards and Procedures	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
<b>26. New Mexico</b>	Program Approval  NCATE Partnership  Title 6 - Primary and Secondary  Licensure Requirements	Need more information	Title 6 - Licensure in Special Education K-12  Licensure Requirements: Special Education pg. 1-4	Comparable in the following area for the Preliminary Level I Credential: Mild to Moderate	NCATE Partnership State  Program Approval  Licensure Requirements	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
<b>27. Indiana</b>	Indiana Professional Standards Board Document: Programs for Teacher Education, Initial and Advanced  NCATE Standards and Procedures  INTASC Standards  University of Indianapolis - NCATE report and course syllabi	Need more information	Indiana Professional Standards Board Document  Teachers of Students with Exceptional Needs	Need more information	Indiana Professional Standards Board Document: Programs for Teacher Education, Initial and Advanced  NCATE Standards and Procedures  INTASC Standards	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
<b>28. South Dakota</b>	New Teacher Certification Rules  Year 2000 Implementation  Professional Education Requirements for Teaching Programs  Requirements for Basic Teaching Programs	Yet to be reviewed	New Teacher Certification Rules  Year 2000 Implementation  Professional Education Requirements for Teaching Programs  Requirements for	Yet to be reviewed	New Teacher Certification Rules  Year 2000 Implementation  Professional Education Requirements for Teaching Programs  Requirements for Basic Teaching Programs	Decision pending receipt of additional information

			<p>Programs Section 24:16 K-12</p> <p>Special Education Program</p> <p>K-12 American Sign Language Education</p>		<p>Article 24:16:01 - 05 Teacher Education Program Approval</p> <p>NCATE Standards</p>	
<b>29. Idaho</b>	<p>Certification Manual</p> <p>NCATE Standards</p> <p>NASDTEC Standards</p>	Need more information	<p>Certification Manual</p> <p>NCATE Standards</p> <p>NASDTEC Standards</p>	Need more information	<p>Certification Manual</p> <p>NCATE Standards and Procedures</p> <p>NASDTEC Standards and Procedures</p> <p>Letter from state</p>	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
<b>30. Florida</b>	<p>Competencies and Skills Required for Teacher Certification in Florida (select sections)</p> <p>Standards for Initial Teacher Education Program Approval in Florida</p> <p>Performance Standards for Continuing Program Approval</p> <p>Accomplished, Professional, and Preprofessional Competencies for Teachers of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century</p> <p>Teacher Education Program Directory</p>	Need more information	<p>Competencies and Skills Required for Teacher Certification in Florida (select sections, including special ed)</p> <p>Standards for Initial Teacher Education Program Approval in Florida</p> <p>Performance Standards for Continuing Program Approval</p> <p>Accomplished, Professional, and Preprofessional Competencies for Teachers of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century</p> <p>Teacher Education Program Directory</p>	Need more information	<p>Competencies and Skills Required for Teacher Certification in Florida (select sections)</p> <p>Standards for Initial Teacher Education Program Approval in Florida</p> <p>Performance Standards for Continuing Program Approval</p> <p>Accomplished, Professional, and Preprofessional Competencies for Teachers of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century</p> <p>State Statutes and Board of Education Rules Governing Program Approval</p> <p>Teacher Education Program Directory</p> <p>Excerpts from the Florida Teacher Education Program Review Guidebook</p> <p>Letter from state</p>	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
<b>31. Wisconsin</b>	<p>Teacher Education Program Approval - Certification Rules</p> <p>Licensing Rules</p> <p>Proposed Order of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction Repealing and Recreating Rules (due to be promulgated July 1, 2000)</p>	<p>Elementary Standards Comparable</p> <p>Secondary Standards Comparable</p>	<p>Teacher Education Program Approval - Certification Rules (Subchapter VII)</p> <p>Licensing Rules</p> <p>Proposed Order of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction Repealing and Recreating Rules (due to be promulgated July 1, 2000)</p>	<p>Comparable in the following areas for the Preliminary Level I Credential: Mild to Moderate (if have learning disabled and emotionally disturbed authorizations), Moderate to Severe (if have cognitive disability and emotionally disturbed authorizations), deaf and hard of hearing, and Early Childhood Special Ed</p> <p>Comparable in the following area for the clear credential: Language, Speech and Hearing with Masters Degree</p>	<p>Teacher Education Program Approval - Certification Rules</p> <p>Licensing Rules</p> <p>Proposed Order of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction Repealing and Recreating Rules (due to be promulgated July 1, 2000)</p>	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable

<b>32. New Hampshire</b>	Standards and Procedures for Approving Professional Programs in New Hampshire  Standards for Graduate Programs	Need more information	Exceptional Children Program Standards	Comparable in the following areas for the Preliminary Level I Credential: Mild to Moderate (if includes Behavior Disorders and Learning Disabled Endorsements), and Deaf and Hard of Hearing	Standards and Procedures for Approving Professional Programs in New Hampshire  Standards for Graduate Programs  Approval of Professional Preparation Programs	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
<b>33. Virginia</b>	Program Directory  Approved Preparation Programs for Instructional Personnel  Virginia Licensure Regulations for School Personnel	Elementary Standards Comparable  Secondary Standards Comparable	Program Directory  Approved Preparation Programs for Instructional Personnel: Special Education pg. 59  Virginia Licensure Regulations for School Personnel	Comparable in the following areas for the Preliminary Level I Credential: Mild to Moderate (with both ED and LD authorizations), Moderate to Severe (with both MR and SD authorizations), Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Visual Impairments, and Early Childhood Special Ed  Comparable in the following area for the clear credential: Language, Speech and Hearing with Masters Degree	Program Directory  Approved Preparation Programs for Instructional Personnel  Virginia Licensure Regulations for School Personnel	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
<b>34. Massachusetts</b>	Regulations for the Certification of Educational Personnel in Massachusetts (pg. 16-19)  Directory of Educator Preparation Programs	Need more information	Regulations for the Certification of Educational Personnel in Massachusetts (pg. 48-54)  Directory of Educator Preparation Programs	Need more information	Regulations for the Certification of Educational Personnel in Massachusetts (pg. 16-19)  Directory of Educator Preparation Programs  Protocol for Initial and Continuing Accreditation (NCATE)	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
<b>35. Hawaii</b>	Hawaii Teacher Standards Board  Teacher Performance Standards  State Approval of Teacher Education Programs, NASDTEC, NCATE  Conducting program reviews  Chaminade University of Honolulu Report  University of Hawaii at Manoa Report  University of Hawaii - Student Teaching Sample  University of Hawaii - Course Syllabi	Need more information	Hawaii Teacher Standards Board  Teacher Performance Standards  Materials for the Preparation of Special Educators (pg. 47-53)  Chaminade University of Honolulu Report  University of Hawaii at Manoa Report  NASDTEC Special Ed Standards	Comparable in the following areas for the Preliminary Level I Credential: Mild to Moderate and Moderate to Severe	Hawaii Teacher Standards Board  Licensing and Certification Policy  State Approval of Teacher Education Programs, NASDTEC, NCATE  Conducting program reviews  Chaminade University of Honolulu Report  University of Hawaii at Manoa Report	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
<b>36. New York</b>	Certification Requirements, Part 52: pg. 5-10  Standards for Approval of Teacher Education	Yet to be reviewed	Certification Requirements, Part 52: pg. 5-10  Standards for Approval of	Yet to be reviewed	Certification Requirements, Part 52: pg. 5-10  Standards for Approval of Teacher Education	Need more information

	<p>Programs: pg. 6-11</p> <p>General Requirements for Teacher Education Programs</p> <p>Teaching to Higher Standards</p>		<p>Teacher Education Programs: pg. 16-22</p> <p>Teaching to Higher Standards</p>		<p>Programs: pg. 6-11</p> <p>Teaching to Higher Standards</p>	
<b>37. North Dakota</b>	<p>Education Standards and Practices Board: Teacher Education Program Approval: Chapters 6,7,8</p> <p>Teacher Certification Section 67</p> <p>Draft Reading University Program Standards</p>	Need more information	<p>Education Standards and Practices Board: Teacher Education Program Approval: Chapters 8.11 (pg. 7), 8.23, and 9.9</p>	Need more information	<p>Education Standards and Practices Board: Teacher Education Program Approval: Chapters 1-6, 9</p> <p>Procedures for Program Approval</p>	<p>Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable</p>
<b>38. Alaska</b>	<p>Teacher Education Standards</p>	Yet to be reviewed	<p>Need special education standards</p>	Yet to be reviewed	<p>Teacher Education Standards</p> <p>Protocol for Continuing Accreditation/Approval</p>	<p>Need more information</p>
<b>39. Iowa</b>	<p>Standards for Practitioner Preparation Programs</p>	Yet to be reviewed	<p>Standards for Practitioner Preparation Programs</p>	Yet to be reviewed	<p>Standards for Practitioner Preparation Programs</p> <p>Manual of Instructions for Preparation of the Institutional Report</p>	<p>Decision pending approval of draft revised standards</p>
<b>40. Texas</b>	<p>Standards for Teacher Education</p> <p>Teacher Certification Handbook</p>	<p>Accreditation Procedures and Standards Not Comparable</p>	<p>Standards for Teacher Education</p> <p>Teacher Certification Handbook</p>	<p>Accreditation Procedures and Standards Not Comparable</p>	<p>Standards for Teacher Education</p> <p>Teacher Certification Handbook</p>	<p>Accreditation Procedures and Standards Not Comparable</p>
<b>41. South Carolina</b>	<p>Policies, Procedures, Unit Standards, and Licensure Area Standards for Teacher Education Program Approval in South Carolina</p> <p>Approved Teacher Education Programs</p>	<p>Elementary Standards Comparable</p> <p>Secondary Standards Comparable</p>	<p>Policies, Procedures, Unit Standards, and Licensure Area Standards for Teacher Education Program Approval in South Carolina</p> <p>Approved Teacher Education Programs</p>	Need more information	<p>Policies, Procedures, Unit Standards, and Licensure Area Standards for Teacher Education Program Approval in South Carolina</p> <p>Approved Teacher Education Programs</p>	<p>Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable</p>
<b>42. Oklahoma</b>	<p>Competencies for Licensure and Certification</p> <p>Standards and Criteria for Oklahoma Accredited Teacher Education Programs and Institutional Plan Guidelines</p> <p>Oklahoma Teacher Preparation Act</p>	Yet to be reviewed	<p>Competencies for Licensure and Certification (pg. 49-59)</p> <p>Oklahoma Teacher Preparation Act</p>	Need more information	<p>Standards and Criteria for Oklahoma Accredited Teacher Education Programs and Institutional Plan Guidelines</p> <p>Oklahoma Teacher Preparation Act</p>	<p>Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable</p>
<b>43. West Virginia</b>	<p>Approval of Educational Personnel Programs</p>	<p>Accreditation Procedures and Standards Not Comparable</p>	<p>Approval of Educational Personnel Programs</p>	<p>Accreditation Procedures and Standards Not Comparable</p>	<p>Approval of Educational Personnel Programs</p>	<p>Accreditation Procedures and Standards Not Comparable</p>
<b>44. Mississippi</b>	<p>Process and Performance Review Guide</p>	<p>Accreditation Procedures and Standards Not</p>	<p>Process and Performance Review Guide</p>	<p>Accreditation Procedures and Standards Not Comparable</p>	<p>Process and Performance Review Guide</p>	<p>Accreditation Procedures and Standards Not Comparable</p>

## **Part Preliminary Findings and Recommendations of the Subject Matter Comparability Studies in English, II: Mathematics, Multiple Subjects (Elementary Education), and Social Science**

### **Introduction**

The comparison of content knowledge requirements in other states is one component of the periodic study required by Section 1 of Assembly Bill 1620. In this agenda report, the preliminary findings of the study of state content knowledge requirements for beginning teachers of English, mathematics, multiple subjects (elementary education), and social science are summarized. Specific state-by-state recommendations of subject matter comparability in the four subject areas are limited to those states for which comparability in accreditation procedures and elementary and secondary pedagogical standards has been established.

As described in the March agenda report on AB 1620, Ms. Linda Wurzbach, of Resources for Learning, is conducting the comparability studies of the subject matter preparation requirements in other states in several phases. In December, we expect to present a complete summary of the results of the English, mathematics, multiple subjects, and social science comparability studies, a summary of the remaining subject area studies in art, French and Spanish, music, physical education, and the sciences, and corresponding subject matter comparability recommendations. In January, staff expect to present a final report of the results of the comparability studies that will include specific state-by-state recommendations of subject matter comparability in thirteen credential subject areas: art, English, French and Spanish, mathematics, multiple subjects, music, physical education, science: biological science, science: chemistry, science: geosciences, science: physics, and social science.

The comparability recommendations in the four subject areas are presented in Table 1 on page 58. Subject-specific details of the basis for the comparability recommendations in Table 1 are provided in Tables 2 through 5 of this report (pages 59 through 61). Appendices I through IV, pages 62 through 80 of this report, include sample analyses (in the four subject areas) of the program approval standards and assessments that provide the basis for the comparability recommendations in Tables 1 through 5. As you review the comparability recommendations, please keep in mind that states' content knowledge standards are frequently under revision. New standards may have been developed and adopted since the analyses were completed, thus the studies that form the basis for these recommendations will be reviewed periodically.

### **Methodology of the Study of State Content Knowledge Requirements**

Ms. Wurzbach began the process of conducting this study by contacting each state to determine its content knowledge requirements for prospective teachers who will be licensed to teach in both elementary and secondary school. State requirements for teacher licenses are generally reflected in licensure tests and program approval standards. States that do not use the National Council of Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) standards were analyzed on the basis of their state program approval standards. States provided Ms. Wurzbach with their program approval standards and, if applicable, the objectives measured on their subject matter assessments.

Among the states that require subject matter assessments of their teacher candidates, the assessment requirement exists in addition to the completion of a specified program of study. California is unique in its use of subject matter examinations as an option to completion of a subject matter program. In this respect, California teacher credential applicants who meet the subject matter competence requirement via the exams may have completed less coursework in the credential subject area than an approved subject matter program requires.

Ms. Wurzbach used California's adopted Program Quality Standards for Subject Matter Programs in English, mathematics, elementary education, and social science in her comparative analysis of each states' content knowledge requirements. The skills and knowledge assessed in California's adopted subject matter examinations provide the basis for comparison in the state-by-state analysis tables in Appendices I through IV of this report. Ms. Wurzbach found that the Commission-adopted assessment specifications (the content outlines that define the knowledge and skills assessed) provide a more detailed description of content requirements than the program standards, and a more easily quantifiable comparison of content requirements. For example, both the English program standards and the English assessment specifications include the study of the domain of Language and Linguistics, but only the test specifications indicate that Language and Linguistics comprise 25 percent of the overall knowledge of English content. In addition, the test specifications provide seven specific areas of knowledge under this domain that must be included on the examinations (e.g., theories of language acquisition and development).

Both the multiple-choice and constructed response components of the subject matter examinations were considered in the analyses of content knowledge requirements in other states. Thus, for the multiple subject analysis, both the MSAT: Content Knowledge Test and the MSAT: Content Area Exercises were considered in establishing the description of subject matter knowledge and competence and in assigning a proportional weight to the specific objectives. The comparisons began with a state's required assessment (if applicable) and proceeded to the program standards if the assessment did not match California's assessment framework.

A state received credit for each objective assessed and/or required for program approval, but did not receive double credit if an objective is included in both the required assessment and program. States were given credit only for content knowledge requirements; credit for additional state requirements in pedagogy or content-specific pedagogy was not given. If a state was found to measure objectives (either via an assessment or program) that are not included in California's assessment framework, the objectives or topics are noted as plus signs in the percentage agreement included in [Table 1](#).



In the subject matter analyses in Appendices I through IV (pages 62 through 80), data are presented for each comparison on the California assessment framework of Subject Matter Knowledge and Competence. A series of Xs show areas of the California framework required by that state. The total percentage of content agreement and significant aspects are noted. The total percent of the state's standards and or/assessments in agreement with California's subject matter competence requirements are noted in [Table 1](#).

Subject Matter Comparability Recommendations

The subject matter comparability recommendations in Table 1 below include only those states with a relatively high percentage match to California's subject matter competency requirements in English, mathematics, multiple subjects, and social science. All seven states included in the comparability recommendations have also been determined to have comparable accreditation procedures and elementary and secondary pedagogical standards.

Table Preliminary Subject Matter Comparability Recommendations for Teaching Credentials in: English, Mathematics, 1: Multiple Subjects (Elementary Education), and Social Sciences

State	English	Mathematics	Multiple Subjects	Social Science
	Percent Agreement	Percent Agreement	Percent Agreement	Percent Agreement
Colorado	°99+			°99
Georgia	°100+		°93+	°94+
Maryland	°100+		°93+	°94+
Missouri	°99+			°99
North Carolina	°*99+			°98
Tennessee	°99+	°91		°98
Virginia	°99+			°98

- \* Multiple credentials exist. Please refer to subject specific Tables 2-5 for details.
- ° Both program approval standards and assessments are required.

Tables 2 through 5 that follow include details of the subject-specific analyses that formed the basis for the comparability recommendations in Table 1. Representative samples of the full analyses of the program approval standards and assessments that qualify each state as comparable in subject matter preparation are provided in Appendices I through IV (pages 62 through 80).

Table 2: English Subject Matter Comparability Analysis

State and License	Percent Agreement	Program Approval Standards	Assessment
Colorado: English Language Arts Education - Early Adolescence: Ages 11-15 and Young Adult: Ages 14-18+	99+	State	Program of Licensing for Colorado Educators: Field 407 English
Georgia: English	100+	NCATE	Praxis II: English Language, Literature, and Composition: Content Knowledge (0041) & English Language Literature and Composition: Essays (0042)
Maryland: English Language and Literature	100+	NCATE	Praxis II: English Language and Literature (0040)
Missouri: English	99+	State	Praxis II: (0041)
North Carolina: Language Arts, Middle Grades 5-9	99+	State	Praxis II: (0041) and English Language, Literature, and Composition: Pedagogy (0043)
English 9-12	99+	State	Praxis II: (0041, 0042, and 0043)
Tennessee: English	99+	State	Praxis II: (0041, 0042, & 0043)
Virginia: English	99+	State	Praxis II: (0040)

Table 3: Mathematics Subject Matter Comparability Analysis

State and License	Percent Agreement	Program Approval	Assessment
-------------------	-------------------	------------------	------------

		Standards	
<b>Tennessee:</b> Endorsement in Mathematics	91	State	Praxis II: Mathematics: Content Knowledge (0061)

Table 4: Multiple Subject (Elementary Education)  
Subject Matter Comparability Analysis

State and License	Percent Agreement	Program Approval Standards	Assessment
<b>Georgia:</b> Elementary Education	93+	NCATE	Praxis II: Elementary Education: Content Area Exercises (0012), and Elementary Education: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment, K-5 (0016)
<b>Maryland:</b> Elementary Education	93+	NCATE	Praxis II: Education in the Elementary School (0010)

Table 5: Social Science Subject Matter Comparability Analysis

State and License	Percent Agreement	Program Approval Standards	Assessment
<b>Colorado:</b> Social Studies Education Early Adolescence: Ages 11-15 and Young Adult: Ages 14-18+	99	State	Program of Licensing for Colorado Educators: Social Studies Education
<b>Georgia:</b> All Social Studies	94+	NCATE	Praxis II: Social Studies: Content Knowledge (0081), and Social Studies: Interpretation of Materials (0083)
<b>Maryland:</b> All Social Studies	94+	NCATE	Praxis II: Social Studies (0080)
<b>Missouri:</b> Social Studies	99	State	Praxis II: (0081)
<b>North Carolina:</b> Social Studies	98	State	Praxis II: (0081), Social Studies: Analytical Essays (0082), and (0083)
<b>Tennessee:</b> All Social Studies	98	State	Praxis II: (Various Social Studies exams)
<b>Virginia:</b> History and Social Science & All Endorsements	98	State	Praxis II: (0080)

Appendix I:  
Colorado English Language Arts Education  
Analysis of Content Knowledge Requirements:  
Program for Licensing Assessments for Colorado Educators  
(PLACE) Examination: English

Colorado English Language Arts Education Early Adolescence:  
Ages 11-15 and Young Adult: Ages 14-18+

California Subject Matter Knowledge and Competence	State Presence	
	In Test PLACE Field 407: English	In Program Standards
<b>Section I: Knowledge of English Literature and Language</b>		
<b>Literature (25.2%)</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Knowledge of major writers and their works (3.6%)</li> </ul>	X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The ability to respond to and interpret literature, including literature from various cultures (3.6%)</li> </ul>	X	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Understanding characteristics of literary types and forms (3.6%)</li> </ul>	X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Understanding writers and works within historical and cultural contexts (3.6%)</li> </ul>	X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Understanding critical approaches to reading and interpreting literature (3.6%)</li> </ul>	X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Understanding elements of literature, including plot, setting, character, point of view, and narrative structure (3.6%)</li> </ul>	X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The ability to respond to and interpret figurative language (3.6%)</li> </ul>	X	
<b>Language and Linguistics (12.6%)</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nature of human language and models of communication (1.8%)</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Structure of language including semantics and syntax (1.8%)</li> </ul>	X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Theories of language acquisition and development (1.8%)</li> </ul>	X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The history and development of the English language and American English (1.8%)</li> </ul>	X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dialects and other aspects of language variation, including jargon, slang, register, and argot (1.8%)</li> </ul>	X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grammatical/linguistic theories, including transformation, generative, and case grammars (1.8%)</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Commonly taught grammatical concepts and conventions (1.8%)</li> </ul>	X	
<b>Rhetoric and Composition (12.6%)</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Composing processes, individual and collaborative, including prewriting, drafting, responding, revising, editing, and evaluating (4.2%)</li> </ul>	X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rhetorical features, including audience and purpose with respect to various contexts and communities of discourse; organization and coherence; types of discourse; voice; types of development; style and tone; and types of appeals (4.2%)</li> </ul>	X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conventions of standard written English, including grammar, usage, and mechanics (4.2%)</li> </ul>	X	

Colorado English Language Arts Education Early Adolescence:  
 Ages 11-15 and Young Adult: Ages 14-18+ (continued)

California Subject Matter Knowledge and Competence	State Presence	
	In Test PLACE Field 407: English	In Program Standards
<b>Section II: Performance Assessment in English (50%)</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Analysis and understanding of cultural passages or works of literature, including their cultural contexts (10%)</li> </ul>	X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Control of language, including diction, syntactic variety, and word choice (10%)</li> </ul>	X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conventions of standard written English (10%)</li> </ul>	X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarity, fluidity, and focus of prose, including sound organization, coherence (10%)</li> </ul>	X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Establishment of theses and thoughtful development of supporting argument (10%)</li> </ul>	X	
<b>Content not covered in California Subject Matter Knowledge and Competence:</b>		

Listening and speaking strategies	X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reading strategies</li> </ul>	X	

Percent Agreement: 99+    Acceptable Match

---

# Appendix II:

## Tennessee Endorsement in Mathematics, 7-12

### Analysis of Content Knowledge Requirements:

### Tennessee Program Approval Standards and

### Praxis II, Mathematics: Content Knowledge Examination

#### Tennessee Endorsement in Mathematics, 7-12

California Subject Matter Knowledge and Competence	State Presence	
	In Test Praxis II: Mathematics: Content Knowledge (0061)	In Program Standards
I. Knowledge of Mathematics (50%)		
Algebra (5%)		
Use of operations and expressions in the solution of algebraic equations (1.25%)	X	X
Linear and matrix (1.25%)	X	X
Algebraic representations for modeling (1.25%)	X	X
Problem-solving (1.25%)	X	X
Geometry (7.5%)		
Axiomatic systems (1.5%)	X	X
Coordinate, or analytical, systems (1.5%)	X	X
Synthetic (1.5%)		X
Non-Euclidean (1.5%)		X
Transformational (1.5%)		X
Functions (12.5%)		
Algebraic and transcendental functions (2.5%)	X	X
Power series (2.5%)		
Limits (2.5%)	X	X
Calculus (2.5%)	X	X
Differential equations (2.5%)	X	X
Number Theory (5%)		
Conjectures about natural numbers (2.5%)		X
Verification of hypotheses through inductive and deductive proofs (2.5%)		X
Mathematical Systems (5%)		
Real and complex number systems (1.66%)	X	X
Boolean algebra (1.66%)		
Symbolic logic (1.66%)		X

Statistics and Probability (7.5%)		
Inferences from charts, tables, and graphs (3.75%)	X	X
Probability distributions, including normal curves, binomials, chi squares, central tendencies, and dispersion (3.75%)	X	X
Discrete Mathematics (5%)		
Matrices and sequences (1%)	X	X
Combanitorics and graph theory (1%)	X	X
Linear programming (1%)	X	X
Difference equations (1%)	X	
Computer science applications (1%)	X	

Tennessee Endorsement in Mathematics, 7-12 (continued)

California Subject Matter Knowledge and Competence	State Presence	
	In Test Praxis II: Mathematics: Content Knowledge (0061)	In Program Standards
History of Mathematics (2.5%)		
Mathematical discoveries and their chronological development (1.25%)		X
The impact of discoveries on human society and thought (1.25%)		X
II. Performance Assessments in Mathematics (50%)		
Solve problems that require understanding of basic concepts and their applications (8.25%)		X
Solve problems that require a deeper conceptual or theoretical understanding (8.25%)		X
Construct a mathematical model that requires understanding of basic concepts and their applications (8.25%)		X
Construct a proof that requires understanding of basic concepts and their applications (15%)		X
Construct a mathematical model or proof that requires a deeper conceptual or theoretical understanding (10%)		X

Percent Agreement: 91 Acceptable Match

---

# Appendix III:

## Georgia Elementary Education Analysis of Content Knowledge Requirements:

National Council of Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)/  
Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI) Standards

Georgia: Multiple Subjects  
NCATE/Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI) Elementary Education  
(e.g., K-6, 1-6, K-8)

California Subject Matter Knowledge and Competence	State Presence	
	In Test	In Program Standards
Section I: Literature and Language Studies (18%)		
Literature (6.3%)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Literary concepts, conventions, terminology (1.5%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assumptions and conventions of primary literary genres, including children's literature (1.5%)</li> </ul>		X

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Social/historical contexts as they relate to literature (1.5%)</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approaches to reading and interpreting literature (1.5%)</li> </ul>		X
<b>Language and linguistics (5.4%)</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Basic stages of language development, including factors that enhance or inhibit this development (1.3%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Historical and cultural influences on the evolution of standard American English (1.3%)</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Principles of linguistics in analyzing various textual contexts (1.3%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Integration of language across disciplines (1.3%)</li> </ul>		X
<b>Oral and written communication (6.3%)</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Application of communication skills to analysis and production of written text (1.25%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Application of communication skills to analysis of oral discourse (1.25)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rhetorical conventions of narration, exposition, reflection, and argumentation (1.25%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retrieval of information from print and non-print sources (1.25%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interpretation of the written reports of research (1.25%)</li> </ul>		
<b>II. Mathematics (18%)</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Number sense and numeration (3.6%)</b> (understand the meaning/implication of number and number concepts as they relate to problem solving, using cardinal and ordinal numbers, place value, ordering of fractions, decimals, and whole numbers)</li> </ul>		X
<b>Geometry (3.6%)</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Knowledge of relationships in both two and three dimensions (1.8%)</li> </ul>		X

NCATE/ACEI Elementary Education (e.g., K-6, 1-6, K-8) (continued)

California Subject Matter Knowledge and Competence	State Presence	
	In Test	In Program Standards
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Measurement (1%)</b> (including knowledge and application of standard units of both the English and metric systems, nonstandard units, estimation, perimeter, area, volume, mass, width, angle measure, time, temperature</li> </ul>		X
<b>Algebraic concepts (1.8%)</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recognize and apply algebraic concepts and properties (.9%)</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Describe patterns by writing or identifying a formula (.9%)</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Number theory (1.8%)</b> (problem solving that demonstrates an understanding of prime and composite numbers, divisibility rules, least common multiple, greatest common divisor and set theory)</li> </ul>		
<b>The real number system and its subsystems (3.6%)</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Solve real-world situational problems (1.2%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop &amp; illustrate strategies for solving complex problems (1.2%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Work with both standard and alternate algorithms (1.2%)</li> </ul>		X

Probability and statistics (2.7%)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Understand the organization, presentation and interpretation of data in various forms (.7%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recognize valid and invalid inferences (.7%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Solve basic problems (.7%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Make predictions involving probability and statistics (.7%)</li> </ul>		X
III. Visual and Performing Arts (10.5%)		
Aesthetic perception/creative expression (4.2%)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Basic art elements (1%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Principles (1%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fundamentals (1%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vocabulary (1%)</li> </ul>		X
Cultural heritage (4.2%)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relate artworks to one another and/or to their artistic, social, historical, cultural, and emotional contexts (1.5%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Differentiate among various styles</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relate aspects of the arts to their geographical origins (1.5%)</li> </ul>		X
Aesthetic valuing (2.1%)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Determine aesthetic criteria (.7%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interpret the meaning of a work of art (.7%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Determine and apply criteria in making judgements of works of art (.7%)</li> </ul>		X

NCATE/ACEI Elementary Education (e.g., K-6, 1-6, K-8) (continued)

California Subject Matter Knowledge and Competence	State Presence	
	In Test	In Program Standards
IV. Physical Education (9%)		
Movement concepts and forms (4.5%)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fundamentals/movement concepts: locomotor, nonlocomotor, and manipulative movements and the concepts of space, effort/quality, and relationships (1.5%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fitness: conditioning, skill-related fitness, and health-related fitness (1.5%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Movement forms: nontraditional games/sports, traditional individual/team games and sports, tumbling and gymnastics (1.5%)</li> </ul>		X
Physical and biological science foundations (3.6%)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Growth and development: characteristics, phases, stages: sensory-perceptual maturation; individual/cultural variation (.9%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Motor learning of children and young adults: information/attention/interest; feedback (.9%)</li> </ul>		X

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Exercise physiology: fitness, testing (based on verbal and quantitative information), drug use, nutrition (.9%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Kinesiology: mechanical principles, injury prevention, basic principles of movement (.9%)</li> </ul>		X
<b>Social science foundations (1%)</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Social aspects of physical education (.5%)</li> </ul>		X
<b>V. Human Development (9%)</b>		
<b>Implications and applications of theory (1.8%)</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Behavioral development (.5%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cognitive development (.5%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Social learning (.5%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Psychosocial development (.5%)</li> </ul>		X
<b>Implications and applications of research (2.7%)</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Family influences/attachment (.3%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Personality/temperament (.3%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Factors affecting achievement (.3%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Aggression/prosocial behavior (.3%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Intelligence and intellectual development (.3%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Play (.3%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Moral development/character education (.3%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effects of substance abuse on the unborn child (.3%)</li> </ul>		X
<b>Major developmental perspectives (1.4%)</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continuity versus discontinuity (.4%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nature versus nurture (.4%)</li> </ul>		X

NCATE/ACEI Elementary Education (e.g., K-6, 1-6, K-8) (continued)

California Subject Matter Knowledge and Competence	State Presence	
	In Test	In Program Standards
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Child-centered versus adult-directed learning (.4%)</li> </ul>		X
<b>Gathering and using information (1%)</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Formal and informal methods of assessing children (.5%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ethical issues (.5%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Human diversity (2.2%)</b> (Questions posed within the content areas delineated above as they pertain to diverse populations)</li> </ul>		X



VI. History/Social Studies (17.5%)		
United States history (4.3%)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Native American civilizations (.4%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>European exploration and colonization (.4%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The American revolution and the founding of the nation (.4%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Growth of the new republic (.4%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Civil War and Reconstruction: causes and consequences (.4%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industrialization of America (.4%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>World War I: causes and consequences (.4%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Post-World War I America (.4%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>World War II: causes and consequences (.4%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Post-World War II America (.4%)</li> </ul>		X
World history (3.9%)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prehistory and the development of early civilizations (.4%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Classical civilizations (.4%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development of world religions (.4%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Feudalism in Japan and Europe (.4%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chinese and Indian empires (.4%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sub-Saharan kingdoms and cultures (.4%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Islamic civilization (.4%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Civilizations of the Americas (.4%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rise and expansion of Europe (.4%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nationalism and imperialism (.4%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Twentieth-century ideologies and conflicts (.4%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Nonhistorical perspective (.4%)</b> (social science questions not posed in historical context)</li> </ul>		X
Government and politics (1.7%)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Political concepts and theories (.85%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>United States political system (.85%)</li> </ul>		X
Geography (3%)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Map and globe skills (.5%)</li> </ul>		X

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Physical geography (.5%)</li> </ul>		X
--	--	---

NCATE/ACEI Elementary Education (e.g., K-6, 1-6, K-8) (continued)

California Subject Matter Knowledge and Competence	State Presence	
	In Test	In Program Standards
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cultural geography (.5%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Political geography (.5%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Economic geography (.5%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regional geography (.5%)</li> </ul>		X
<b>Economics (2%)</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Basic economic concepts (1%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Government's role in the economy (1%)</li> </ul>		X
<b>Anthropology (1.7%)</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Definitions, research methods, techniques of study (.5%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Human culture, social organization (.5%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How cultures change (.5%)</li> </ul>		X
<b>VII. Science (18%)</b>		
<b>Biology (5.7%)</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cellular biology: biologically important molecules, structure and function of cells and their organelles, energy sources and processes, and genes and gene function (1.4%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biology of organisms: life forms, structure and function of organ systems, and basic principles of heredity (1.4%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ecology, interrelationships in the biosphere: characteristics of ecosystems, energy flow in biological communities, and characteristics of biological communities (1.4%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evolution: evolutionary mechanisms, evolutionary patterns, evidence for evolutionary change, and history of life as related to the geological timeline (1.4%)</li> </ul>		X
<b>Geoscience (5.7%)</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Astronomy: the solar system and planetary systems, stars and galaxies, and cosmology (1.4%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Geology: Earth materials, internal processes, land forms and external processes, and the history of the Earth and its life forms (1.4%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meteorology: Atmospheric composition and structure, atmospheric movement, and weather and climate (1.4%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Oceanography: Biological, chemical, geological, and physical processes and characteristics (1.4%)</li> </ul>		X
<b>Physical sciences (5.7%)</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Matter: Characteristics, structure, and physical and chemical properties (.8%)</li> </ul>		X

California Subject Matter Knowledge and Competence	State Presence	
	In Test	In Program Standards
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Reactions and interactions: kinetic theory, changes in state, chemical reactions, oxidation and reduction, acids and bases, catalysts, and chemical bonding (.8%)</li></ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Macromechanics: straight line, projectile, circular, and periodic motion, Newton's laws of motion, gravity, weight, mass, and conservation laws (.8%)</li></ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Energy: sources and transformations and heat (.8%)</li></ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Electricity and magnetism: static and current electricity, circuits, magnetism, and applications (.8%)</li></ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Wave phenomena: electromagnetic spectrum, mirrors, lenses, sound production, and applications (.8%)</li></ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Modern physics/nuclear chemistry: relativity, radioactivity, fusion, and fission (.8)</li></ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Science and Technology and Process Skills (1%)</li></ul>		X
Content not covered in California Standards		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Psychology, sociology</li></ul>		X

Percent Agreement: 93+ Acceptable Match

Appendix IV:

Missouri Social Science

Analysis of Content Knowledge Requirements:  
State Program Approval Standards and  
Praxis II, Social Studies: Content Knowledge Examination

Missouri Social Science

California Subject Matter Knowledge and Competencies	State Presence	
	In Test Praxis II: 0081	In Program Standards
I. World History (10%)		
A. Ancient history (pre-history to about 200 A.D.) (3.2%)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Transition from nomadic-pastoral tribal societies to sedentary cultures (Paleolithic to Neolithic Revolution) (.8%)</li></ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Emergence of cities and organized states (e.g., Mesopotamia, Egypt, China, India) (.8%)</li></ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Cultural diffusion and political evolution through war, expansion, and commerce-spreading civilizations (e.g., Greece, Rome, China, India) (.8%)</li></ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Emergence of great world religions and philosophies (e.g., Greek thought, Roman law, Chinese Confucianism, Asian Buddhism, Judeo-Christian traditions) (.8%)</li></ul>	X	X

B. Medieval and early modern history (200 A.D. to 18th century A.D.) (3.6%)		
• Breakup of Greco-Roman Mediterranean polity (.6%)	X	X
• Continuity of Chinese Empire across dynastic changes (.6%)	X	X
• Forging of Japan's distinctiveness (.6%)	X	X
• Evolution of territorial and city-based polities in Eurasia, South America, and Africa (.6%)	X	X
• Evolution of western thought from medieval scholasticism through the Renaissance and Reformation to the Scientific Revolution (.6%)	X	X
• Global impact of the first Age of Exploration and Colonialism through mid-18 <sup>th</sup> Century (.6%)	X	X
C. Modern history (18 <sup>th</sup> Century A.D. to the present) (3.3%)		
• Secular ideologies beginning with the Enlightenment: their global diffusion through trade, industrialism, wars, and revolution (e.g., Democracy, Liberalism, Socialism, Nationalism, Marxism, Communism, Fascism, and Nazism) (1.1%)	X	X
• Fusion of industrialism and science to transform the world (e.g., Darwin, Einstein, Heisenberg, Freud) (1.1%)	X	X
• From World War I to the present (1.1%)	X	X
II. United States History (10%)		
A. Before the arrival of the Europeans (2.5%)		
• North American Indian tribes (.5%)	X	X
• Geography of the area to be colonized (.5%)	X	X
• Conditions of the European civilization that led to colonization (.5%)	X	X
• Establishment of North American colonies (Spanish, French, Dutch, and English) (.5%)	X	X
• Maturation of the English colonies (.5%)	X	X

Missouri Social Science (continued)

California Subject Matter Knowledge and Competencies	State Presence	
	In Test Praxis II: 0081	In Program Standards
B. Making a new nation (2.4%)		
• The 1760s (.4%)	X	X
• Causes of the American Revolution (.4%)	X	X
• Revolutionary War (.4%)	X	X
• Articles of Confederation (.4%)	X	X
• Development of a new constitution (.4%)	X	X

Government and economy during the nation's first 25 years (.4%)		
<b>C. Times of growth and conflict (2.7%)</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Social attitudes and philosophies in the young nation (slavery, religion, Indian tribes, women, popular culture) (.3%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Jacksonian Democracy (.3%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Western expansion, Manifest Destiny, and the American Empire (.3%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Coming of the Civil War (.3%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Civil War (.3%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reconstruction (.3%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maturation of the national economy, 1860-1900 (.3%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development of a distinct, separate American culture (.3%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>U.S. assumption of a world role (.3%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<b>D. Progressive Era to the present: continuity and change (2.4%)</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reform efforts (women, African-Americans, Asians) (.3%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>American world role during the Progressive Era, including World War I (.3%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Economy and society in the 1920s and 1930s (.3%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>World War II and U.S. assumption of a world role (.3%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Social and economic change in a time of rapid economic growth (e.g., urbanization, suburbanization, the family, African-Americans, the New Frontier, the Great Society) (.3%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Cold War of Latin America, Africa, and Asia, including Vietnam (.3%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Nixon Era (.3%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The US in recent times (.3%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<b>III. Geography (10%)</b>		
<b>A. Physical geography (5%)</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Map literacy and place-awareness skills (1%)</li> </ul>	X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Earth-sun relationships and energy balance (1%)</li> </ul>	X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Weather, climate, hydrology, landforms, and volcanism (1%)</li> </ul>	X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Energy sources and natural resources (1%)</li> </ul>	X	

Missouri Social Science (continued)

<div> <div>California Subject Matter Knowledge and Competencies</div> </div>	State Presence	
	In Test Praxis II:	In Program

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Soils and vegetation (1%)</li> </ul>	X	
<b>B. Cultural geography (5%)</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Locational processes (1%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Human and environmental interaction (1%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Human movements (1%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>World religions (1%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regions (Anglo-American, European, Latin American, Sino-Japanese, Indian, South Pacific, and Pacifica) (1%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<b>IV. Political Science (7.5%)</b>		
<b>A. U.S. government and politics (2%)</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Federalism and Separation of Powers (.4%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Political parties, interest groups, and the press (.4%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>State and local government, including "Direct Democracy" in western states (.4%)</li> </ul>	X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evolving federalism (.4%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Civil rights and civil liberties (.4%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regime legitimacy and constitutionalism (.6%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<b>B. Comparative Government and Politics (1.8%)</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Variations in institutions (legislature, executive, federalism) (.6%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Role of party of parties (.6%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regime legitimacy and constitutionalism (.6%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<b>C. International relations (1.8%)</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>War and peace (.6%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>International organizations and diplomacy (.6%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Non-state actors (.6%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<b>D. Political theory and philosophy (1.8%)</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Justice and the role of the state (.3%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Constitutionalism (.3%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Representative democracy (.3%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Authoritarian systems (left, right, and center) (.3%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Individual efficacy (.3%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Political development (.3%)</li> </ul>	X	X

V. Economics (7.5%)		
A. History of economic thought (1.4%)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adam Smith (.2%)</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>David Ricardo (.2%)</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thomas Malthus (.2%)</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Karl Marx (.2%)</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thorsten Veblen (.2%)</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>John Maynard Keynes (.2%)</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Milton Friedman (.2%)</li> </ul>		

Missouri Social Science (continued)

California Subject Matter Knowledge and Competencies	State Presence	
	In Test Praxis II: 0081	In Program Standards
B. Microeconomics (1.4%)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The basic economic problem (.2%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The forces of tradition, command, and the market (.2%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The concepts of trade-offs, opportunity costs, and marginal analysis (.2%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Laws of Supply and Demand (.2%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The forms of doing business in a market society, including labor markets (.2%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The structure of markets and industrial concentration (.2%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The behavior of consumers, business, labor, and government in the American mixed economy (.2%)</li> </ul>	X	X
C. Macroeconomics (1.5%)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The nature and causes of unemployment and inflation (.3%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The goals of economic growth, stability, and efficiency; and sociopolitical goals with economic aspects (.3%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Measures of economic performance (.3%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Money, banking, and monetary policy (.3%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public finance, taxation, and fiscal policy (.3%)</li> </ul>	X	X
D. International trade and finance (1.5%)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comparative and absolute advantage (.3%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The structure of the world economy and the nature of specialization and trade (.3%)</li> </ul>	X	X

The balance of trade and the balance of payments (.3%)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Exchange rates and foreign exchange markets (.3%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Issues of third-world economics and linkages to developed economies (.3%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<b>E. Comparative economic systems (1.5%)</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Characteristics of centrally-planned economies compared with market and mixed economies (.75%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The nature and causes of economic development (.75%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<b>VI. Behavioral Sciences (5%)</b>		
<b>A. Understanding individuals (1.8%)</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Human development, learning, and motivation (.2%)</li> </ul>	X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Socialization processes (.2%)</li> </ul>	X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Role of the family (.2%)</li> </ul>	X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adult change and adjustment (.2%)</li> </ul>	X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cognitive processes (.2%)</li> </ul>	X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Personality (.2%)</li> </ul>	X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Childhood and adolescence (.2%)</li> </ul>	X	

Missouri Social Science (continued)

California Subject Matter Knowledge and Competencies	State Presence	
	In Test Praxis II: 0081	In Program Standards
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Values (.2%)</li> </ul>	X	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Authoritarianism (.2%)</li> </ul>	X	
<b>B. Understanding American society (1.8%)</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Groups and group norms (.3%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conformity/deviance (.3%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Roles of individuals in groups (.3%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Leader-follower relationships (.3%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Class, race, ethnicity, and gender (.3%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discrimination and prejudice (.3%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<b>C. Understanding other societies (1.4%)</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Physical anthropology and development (.2%)</li> </ul>	X	X



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Culture and cultural change (.2%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enculturation and assimilation (.2%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community/society (.2%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Structural-functional understanding of cultures and societies (.2%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non-Western societies (.2%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ethnocentrism (.2%)</li> </ul>	X	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Making interdisciplinary connections among social science fields (10%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Providing a well-documented and well-organized analysis of social science content (10%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Applying social science knowledge to historical and contemporary issues (10%)</li> </ul>		X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Applying social science knowledge to content reflecting experiences of diverse groups of Americans or non-Western countries (10%)</li> </ul>		X

Percent Agreement: 99 Acceptable Match



# California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

**Meeting of:** November 3-4, 1999

**Agenda Item Number:** PREP-4

**Committee:** Preparation Standards

**Title:** A Report on Teaching Internship Grant Programs 1994-1999: Lessons Learned & Challenges to Face

✓ Information

**Prepared by:** Michael McKibbin, Ed.D., Consultant  
Professional Services Division

## Summary of an Agenda Report

### Teaching Internship Programs 1994-1999: Lessons Learned and Challenges to Face

Professional Services Division  
October 20, 1999

#### Executive Summary

Education Code Sections §44382 to §44384 authorize the Commission to provide grants to teaching internship projects to assist school districts meet their needs for qualified schoolteachers. From 1994 to 1999 the Commission has distributed \$27 million to districts to prepare nearly 20, 000 interns.

This agenda item presents a summary of the goals and purposes of the program and a summary of the growth and achievements of teaching internships since 1994. The item provides a description of the characteristics of internships and the variance among projects. Finally, the item provides information on the lessons that have been learned and the challenges that must be faced if this program is to continue achieving its goals.

#### Relationship to the Commission's Strategic Goals and Objectives

Goal One: To Promote Education Excellence in California's schools.

#### Fiscal Impact Statement

The funds to support teaching internship projects are provided from the General Fund and are governed by the provisions of Proposition 98. The funds to pay the operations costs to administer the teaching internship program come from the Commission's base budget.

#### Recommendation

This item is provided for the information of the Commission.

**Enabling Legislation:**

On October 10, 1993, Governor Wilson signed AB 1161 (Quackenbush), which enacted Chapter 1147 of the Statutes of 1993. This statute requires the Executive Director of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing to award grant funds to alternative certification programs that recruit, prepare and support intern teachers in California public schools (K-12). AB 1161 defined alternative certification programs as *internship programs* in two categories. First, Education Code Section 44384 authorizes the Executive Director to award funds to *University Internship Programs* pursuant to the provisions of a 1967 statute. Second, §44384 authorizes the award of funds to *District Internship Programs* pursuant to a 1983 law. In AB 1161, lawmakers offered legislative and fiscal support for both kinds of *teaching internship programs*.

In February 1997, AB 18 (Mazzoni, Pringle) was passed and signed by the Governor. This bill, among other items, increased the size of teaching internship grants to \$6.5 million. The bill added to the areas on which the grants should focus that of helping districts meet the needs for teachers caused by reducing class size. The Governor's Budget for fiscal year 1998-99 increased the Teaching Internship Grant Budget to \$11 million.

On several occasions, California lawmakers have taken action to encourage the growth of internship programs for new teachers. In 1967 the *Teacher Education Internship Act of 1967* was enacted which continues to be effective as Sections 44450 through 44467 of the Education Code. In 1983, lawmakers enacted the *Hughes-Hart Education Reform Act* (Senate Bill 813), and established additional internships that are governed by Code Sections 44325 through 44329, and 44830.3. Then, in 1993, the *Alternative Teacher Certification Act of 1993* (AB 1161, Quackenbush) was passed, which established funding criteria for the two kinds of internships established previously, and AB 18 expanded the program in 1997.

### **Purposes of the Teaching Internship Grant Program:**

The first purpose of internship programs for new teachers is to expand the pool of qualified teachers by attracting persons into teaching who might not otherwise enter the classroom, and those who bring valuable attributes into teaching. These groups include career changers, those underrepresented in the teaching workforce, those committed to teaching in hard-to-staff schools, content and credential shortage fields, and those who could not enter a traditional program because of economic, family or other reasons.

The second purpose of teaching internships is to enable K-12 schools to respond immediately to pressing needs while providing professional preparation for interns that is as extensive and systematic as traditional programs, and that links education theory with classroom practice throughout each intern's preparation.

The third purpose of internships is to provide effective supervision and intensive support so each new intern's learning can be targeted to her/his needs, and so beginning teachers who are interns can extend, apply and refine what they learn about teaching in the course of their initial preparation.

Beginning in the 1996-97 school year, Governor Wilson's Class Size Reduction Initiative substantially increased the demand for K-3 teachers. To help school districts meet this demand, the Commission took a series of policy actions in August and October, 1996. On February 6, 1997, Governor Wilson signed Assembly Bill 18, which added \$4.5 million dollars from the General Fund to the Commission's budget specifically for the purpose of expanding internship programs for the Class Size Reduction Initiative. The augmentation legislation retained the original purposes of internships, and created two additional purposes.

- (1) Facilitate the reduction of class size in kindergarten and grades one to three.
- (2) Improve reading and mathematics instruction in the reduced classes that are taught by interns in the funded programs.

Internship programs allow schools to place in classrooms those prospective teachers who want to put their energies directly into their jobs and "learn by doing." Educational agencies have offered internships to enable non-traditional candidates to enter the profession. The grant funds provide the means to extend access to those candidates who are not reached by conventional programs and options.

Internship programs blend theory and practice and provide ways for school districts to respond immediately to pressing teacher needs. Because these programs focus on specific groups of prospective teachers, they target their preparation and support services to the particular needs of each individual. Programs are designed to identify each intern's entry-level skills, and to concentrate on what he or she needs. Internships also provide opportunities for schools and districts to become more active participants in preparing teachers, in collaboration with accredited colleges and universities.

To contribute to the success of Class Size Reduction, the Teaching Internship Request for Proposals (RFP) asked the sponsors of programs to include specific preparation and support in the management of classes with twenty or fewer students in the primary grades. The funding provided through this RFP is focused on helping school districts meet the need for teachers as a result of the Class Size Reduction Initiative. One of the purposes of this initiative is to improve mathematics and reading instruction. In each proposal those requesting grant funds were required to provide a description of the curriculum that interns will receive that will provide the skills and knowledge to teach reading and mathematics.

**Growth of Intern Programs**

More than 12,000 teachers have been prepared through teaching internship projects. Projects have also pledged to prepare more than 7,900 teachers in the current academic year. Of Sixty-five projects that currently receive funding, four programs prepare only single subject teachers, and fourteen other programs prepare single subject teachers as part of their program. Nine of the projects prepare only special education teachers, and three other projects prepare special education teachers as one part of their program. Forty-two projects prepare elementary teachers. Of the elementary and secondary teachers prepared in 1998-99, ninety-two per cent were prepared as CLAD teachers. Of that number eighteen per cent are in BCLAD internships.

Table 1 shows the growth rate of the teaching internship program in its six years of existence. In 1998-99 internships grew by sixteen percent. If projects are able to meet their pledges, the program will grow more than thirty per cent in 1999-2000. The number of districts who are participating in internships grew by twenty per cent, and the new programs are reaching into new areas of the state.

Table 2 shows the distribution of internship programs by the type of program in 1999-2000. Four new universities have joined the teaching internship program this year. Three are private and independent colleges or universities and one is an additional University of California campus. All but three of the California State Universities are participating in teaching internship programs. One program at Sonoma State University chose not to renew its grant and instead will participate with CALTEACH, the CSU Systemwide effort. With UCLA becoming a participant, half of the University of California campuses are participants. Approximately one quarter of the private and independent colleges are participants. There are eight projects that are district internships.

**Table 1**  
**Growth of the Intern Program**  
**1994-1999**

Fiscal Year	Programs	Number of Interns Served	Number of Districts Involved	Dollars Available (Millions)	Annual Growth (%)
94-95	29	1238	150	2	
95-96	23	1471	178	2	16%
96-97	23	1888	186	2 Plus Carryover	22%
97-98	52	3706	271	4.5 Plus Carryover	51%
98-99	58	4340	330	6.5 Plus Carryover	14%

99-00	65	7923 Projected	409 (Projected)	11 Plus Carryover	55%
-------	----	-------------------	--------------------	----------------------	-----

**Table 2**  
**Participation Totals**  
**Teaching Interns 1999-2000**

<b>Districts and County Offices of Education</b>	<b>420 (of 996)</b>
<b>California Colleges and Universities</b>	<b>36 (of 75)</b>
<b>California Counties</b>	<b>43 (of 58)</b>

<b>Type of Program</b>	<b>California State University</b>	<b>University of California</b>	<b>Private and Independent College or University</b>	<b>District Intern</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Renewing</b>	1447	15	233	162	1857
<b>Continuing</b>	2080	203	130	2142	4555
<b>New</b>	1279	40	192	0	1511
<b>Total</b>	4806	258	555	2304	7923
<b>Percent of Total</b>	60.6%	3.2%	7.1%	29%	

### **Profile of Teaching Intern Programs and Interns**

Project directors were recently surveyed by Commission staff to obtain specific information about each program. Tables 3 through 8 provide information about the nature of the programs and the interns who are being prepared as teachers by those programs.

**Table 3** shows that intern programs vary considerable in length. University intern programs may, by statute, extend over one or two years. Only one program is as short as the statutory minimum of one year. California statutes require that district intern programs be no less than two academic year's duration, but also includes a pre-service program. More than half of the programs spread the instruction, support and assessment over two academic years and at least one summer.

**Table 3**  
**Length of Teaching Internship Programs**

N = 54

<b>PROGRAM LENGTH</b>	<b>NUMBER OF PROGRAMS</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE OF PROGRAMS</b>
NINE TO TEN MONTHS	1	1.9%
TWELVE MONTHS	5	9.3%
FIFTEEN MONTHS	8	14.8%
EIGHTEEN MONTHS	9	16.7%
TWENTY-ONE MONTHS	10	18.5%
TWENTY-FOUR MONTHS	21	38.9%

The frequency and length of the instructional program offered by projects varies considerably from program to program. Nearly half of the projects offer instruction one afternoon a week in either a three or a four hour block. Slightly over one-fourth of the

programs meet two afternoons a week, and the remaining programs offer a variety of formats including some afternoons, some Saturday activities and occasional seminars. The average number of semester units in a university intern program is thirty-three, and the average number of clock hours in a district intern program is more than 500 clock hours (the equivalent of 33 semester hours).

All intern programs must provide a "pre-service" preparation component before an intern takes over responsibility of the intern's classroom. District Intern programs vary from 120 to 160 clock hours in areas specified by statute. University intern programs vary from six quarter units to 15 semester units of instruction before taking over responsibility for a classroom as an intern teacher.

All of the district intern programs and many of the university intern programs use an instructional structure that is more compact and more specific than the traditional three semester or quarter units for a course. This allows the units of instruction to be offered in a more timely manner when it is needed since these teachers are fully responsible for a group or groups of students. Some content areas such as reading and classroom management can be revisited several times throughout the programs.

**Table 4**  
**Frequency of Course Offerings During the Academic Year**

N = 54

FREQUENCY	NUMBER OF PROGRAMS	PERCENTAGE OF PROGRAMS
ONCE A WEEK FOR 3 HOURS	17	31.5%
ONCE A WEEK FOR 4 HOURS	9	16.7%
TWICE A WEEK FOR 2 HOURS	4	7.4%
TWICE A WEEK FOR 3 HOURS	7	13.0%
TWICE A WEEK FOR 4 HOURS	4	7.4%
LENGTH VARIES	13	24.1%

Table 5 shows there are seventeen programs that serve one large school district only. Six of those are district intern programs and eleven are university intern programs. One program through California State University, Fresno has developed partnerships with 67 different districts. Rural programs quite naturally tend to serve larger numbers of districts than projects located in urban areas. Some of the special education projects prepare teachers for vast service areas. For example, the program led by California State University, Chico serves intern teachers in counties across Northern California from those bordering on the Pacific Ocean to counties bordering on the Oregon and Nevada borders. The California State University, San Bernardino Mild/Moderate Educational Specialist Program serves most of the high desert areas of Southeastern California, and the San Diego State-Imperial Valley Project serves some of the poorest and most isolated communities in the state.

**Table 5**  
**Districts Served by the Teaching Internship Projects**

N = 52

NUMBER OF DISTRICTS PROGRAM SERVES	NUMBER OF PROGRAMS	PERCENTAGE OF PROGRAMS
ONE DISTRICT	17	32.6%
2 TO 9 DISTRICTS	16	30.8%
10 TO 19 DISTRICTS	9	17.3%
20 TO 29 DISTRICTS	5	9.6%
30 TO 39 DISTRICTS	2	3.8%

40 TO 49 DISTRICTS	2	3.8%
50+ DISTRICTS	1	1.9%

Most interns demonstrate their subject matter competence by passing the appropriate examination. Table 6 displays these data. In 1998-99, the number of persons in student teaching based preparation programs who demonstrated subject matter competence by exam was 61%, so the difference with internship programs is only slight. Six single subject programs in certain subject areas require that interns have taken or take certain content courses regardless of whether they have passed the exam in that content area.

**Table 6**  
**Methods of Demonstrating Subject Matter Competence**

METHOD	PERCENTAGE OF INTERNS USING THIS METHOD
BY EXAMINATION	62.4%
BY APPROVED PROGRAM OF COURSES	31.9%
BY DETERMINATION OF EQUIVALENCY TO APPROVED PROGRAM OF COURSES	4.8%
BY EXAMINATION PLUS COMPLETION OF SPECIFIED COURSES	0.8%

Table 7 displays the data on the passing rate on the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA) of teachers from intern programs. Thirty-one of the responding projects have had students who attempted the RICA. Half of these projects have a 95% pass rate or higher, and two-thirds of the programs have a rate higher than 90%. The statewide, first time passing rate is 84% and the cumulative rate is 91%.

**Table 7**  
**Per Program Passage Rate for the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA)**

N = 31

PERCENTAGE OF INTERNS IN PROGRAM THAT PASSED RICA	NUMBER OF PROGRAMS REPORTING THIS PASSAGE RATE	PERCENTAGE OF PROGRAMS WITH THIS RATE
100%	12	38.7%
95% OR HIGHER	2 (+12)	45.2%
90% OR HIGHER	7 (+14)	67.7%
80% OR HIGHER	4 (+21)	80.6%
70% OR HIGHER	4 (+25)	93.5%
BELOW 70%	2	6.5%

As Table 8 displays, in most of the programs intern teachers are responsible for students on a full-time basis. In seven programs a certain number of the students are on less than full time contracts or shared contracts, and the remainder are on full-time contracts.

**Table 8**  
**Full Time/Part time Distribution of Intern's Assignments**

N=47

ASSIGNMENT TYPE	NUMBER OF PROGRAMS	PERCENTAGE OF PROGRAMS
-----------------	--------------------	------------------------

FULL TIME	39	83.0%
PART TIME	1	2.1%
SOME FULL TIME/ SOME PART TIME	7	14.9%

Projects were asked to describe the methods that they used to assess the performance of intern teachers. Table 9 displays, in frequency order, the methods that are used. Besides the traditional methods of evaluation, projects have been encouraged to use methods that are not as readily available in student-teaching-based preparation programs. For example, projects have been encouraged to find ways to collect achievement data since interns are responsible for the achievement of the students in their classrooms. One quarter of the programs have accomplished that goal.

**Table 9**  
**Types Of Performance Assessment Data Collected**

N = 51

ASSESSMENT TYPE	NUMBER OF PROGRAMS COLLECTING THESE DATA	PERCENTAGE OF PROGRAMS COLLECTING THESE DATA
COURSE GRADES	49	96.1%
PORTFOLIO	45	88.2%
OBSERVATION BASED ON CSTP	42	82.4%
OBSERVATION USING COMPETENCY CHECK LIST	29	56.9%
STULL-TYPE EVALUATION	20	39.2%
STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA	13	25.5%
OTHER STUDENT WORK	13	25.5%
CFASST	6	11.8%
OTHER VALIDATED INSTRUMENT	6	11.8%
PATHWAYS	4	7.8%

Table 10 presents data on the cost of intern programs to the interns. The cost of intern programs varies greatly. Of the fifty-two programs reporting on this question, the range of costs is from \$475 to \$16,425. The total mean cost per project to the intern is \$5,789. These costs include tuition costs, student fees, costs of books and materials, and credential fees.

Eleven of the projects provide reductions in the fees that are charged. These reductions range from \$150 to \$5,350. The sources of these funds include federal grants, portions of the teaching internship grant, private or corporate grants, and tuition or fee reductions offered by the university or payments of fees, e.g. credential fees, by the district.

Annual intern salaries vary from nearly \$30,000 to more than \$37,000. California statute allows university intern salaries to be reduced by up to 12.5 % with those funds to be used for supervision. Of the 43 university intern programs that responded to this question, only four exercise this option.

**Table 10**  
**Cost of Teaching Internship Program to an Intern**

N = 52

PROGRAM COST	NUMBER OF PROGRAMS IN	PERCENTAGE OF PROGRAMS IN
--------------	-----------------------	---------------------------



	RANGE	RANGE
LESS THAN \$2000	6	11.5%
\$2000 TO \$3999	13	25.0%
\$4000 TO \$5999	16	30.8%
\$6000 TO \$7999	7	13.5%
\$8000 TO \$9999	3	5.8%
\$10,000 AND HIGHER	7	13.5%

## Lessons Learned and Challenges to Face

As part of the annual report, project directors are asked to reflect on the lessons that they have learned and the issues that are the most perplexing for them to face. The ideas that they offer, the quantitative data and qualitative data that are gathered, and information gained through 30 site visits completed in the last year lead staff to conclude that there are certain components that tend to make a difference in the quality of the internship program.

Recruitment/Selection. Internships are not for everyone. Internships are better suited for those who bring prior work experiences and maturity to the teaching experience. One third of the programs are using instruments such as the Haberman Teacher Selection Interview that has the capacity to examine an intern applicant's pre-dispositions toward teaching. Nearly all who use this type of instrument note that the quality of candidates has improved.

Projects have had minimal success in recent years in attracting persons into their programs from aerospace industries and the military. The entry of aerospace personnel into teaching is in inverse proportion to the California economy. Program directors state that even though there is interest, salaries just are not competitive. In recent years the number of personnel in the military has declined. The armed services are trying to retain their members, including giving bonuses to stay. Internships are also not as attractive as was originally thought for transitioning military personnel since most require integrated instruction and practice. Most military personnel can not be released from other duties as would be required by an internship.

Internship programs have been quite successful in attracting those underrepresented in the teaching workforce. More than 46 per cent of all interns are from "minority" ethnic, linguistic and racial groups. Nearly thirty per cent of the elementary teachers are male. Other second career persons are well represented in internship programs. Internships have served as the last stage of a career ladder into teaching for paraprofessionals.

Teaching internships seem to select persons who are interested in teaching in California's hardest to staff schools. The interns tend to stay in these classrooms at far greater rates than persons prepared by other methods. The last three years of data show an 85% retention rate.

The impact of recruitment efforts, particularly on retention and on reducing emergency permits, is reflected in the following comments by project directors.

"Because of this project, regional use of emergency permit personnel has declined dramatically. Prior to the development of an intern program in this region, a majority of special education teachers acquired their special education certification while they participated in a lengthy, unstructured, unsupported training period while serving under the emergency permit."  
-- Northeastern California Partnership for Special Education

"Perhaps not to be overlooked in our success is our retention rate. Of the ninety-two interns chosen to participate in the first two years, eighty-eight are still teaching in the district. Of the (ninety-two) four had to exit for lack of identification clearance, one for medical leave for a reoccurrence of medical difficulties, one to return to a previous occupation, and one wanted to complete teacher preparation in the traditional manner. We feel very proud of this record considering that the first year the program was being created in some instances as we went."

-- Sacramento City USD/CSU Sacramento Teacher Intern Program

The Support Network. Project directors and interns in interviews almost unanimously identify the support that they receive from project personnel and their fellow interns as the most powerful and important aspect of the program. Those programs that have several layers of support and yet are mindful not to have too much overlap are seen as the most successful. It is important that support be site based and that it occurs from the beginning of an intern's first day of classroom responsibility.

Interns frequently talk about the importance of proceeding through a program as a cohort. The interns discussed how they help each other and how other interns provide both ideas and moral support. The interns that staff has interviewed clearly are invested in the success of the other teachers in their cohort. Project Directors reflected on the importance of cohorts in the following statements.

"The cohort system of support also creates a safe environment for interns to take risk. Coursework occurs on two afternoons each week. At the beginning of each class, time is set aside for interns to discuss success and analyze failures with the members of their cohort. In watching this process I have been impressed with the level of reflection and exchange of ideas."

-- Project IMPACT

"In the first year of the UCSC Internship Program many lessons have been learned. One of the most vivid is the power of the cohort. The UCSC interns attending course work together throughout the year developed a strong group support, in depth grade level sharing and a willingness to trust enough to truly develop as a learning community. In relationship to the cohort, the program learned about the need and importance of providing individual interns with scaffolding as they moved through all of the requirements and stresses of coursework, daily teaching, state exams and details of credentialing."

-- UC Santa Cruz Internship Grant Program

"One interesting learning gleaned from Pathwise observations has been how often interns mention that they learned an idea or technique from another intern. Sometimes they gather this knowledge in the assigned courses, sometimes in the seminar for Intern Teaching/Paravision and sometimes in the support sessions with mentors. This speaks highly to the cohort arrangement also. Secondly, bonding with staff and/or principal seems to make a difference especially in schools where there is only one intern present. Even in our schools with our most needy students, interns who feel part of a team seem to flourish. At our sites with three or more interns, just the bonding with the other interns has proved quite valuable.

-- Sacramento City USD/CSU Sacramento Teacher Intern Program

Finding high quality support providers is a great challenge for projects. In many cases the intern project is competing with both the Pre-intern and the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program for support providers. Intern directors state that the cap of \$1,500 in an intern program puts them at a considerable disadvantage when recruiting support providers. Another challenge was finding the time and resources to release support providers and interns so that high quality formative feedback could occur.

Building Partnerships. Many of the projects have commented on how important it is to build strong partnerships between the participating districts and the participating universities. They also commented that shared decision-making, and developing true partnerships was considerably more difficult than previous interactions among universities and districts.

The most successful partnerships developed their interrelationship on four levels. Decisions about program components were made together and with parity. There were clear lines of responsibility. Some of the programs talked out the "investment" that each party was making in the relationship, and they shared common goals in the preparation of quality teachers. Second, in most of the projects the instructional staff included both university professors and district personnel. In some instances classes were co-taught by a professor and a district educator. Third, the support system was coordinated and there were opportunities for sharing information. Most programs used a seminar format and regularly scheduled feedback sessions to facilitate providing information.

Another important aspect was the importance of leadership of the program. Particularly important was continuity and consistency. In those programs where there were no clear lines of authority or when the leadership changed, these programs had difficulty. The most successful programs were those where the district and the university saw this method of teacher preparation as an investment. Projector Directors comments on partnerships are represented by the following statements.

"Mentoring and instructional support from exemplary teachers is the most valuable part of the new inexperienced teacher's first year. This relationship is as important as the relation with the Human Resources Departments. It takes time and patience to build relationships with all the necessary partners within districts and the counties of the two consortia."

-- Project Pipeline

"The most obvious success of the internship program for 1998-1999, was the weekly observations that the Coordinator of Fieldwork Experience conducted with each intern during the fall semester, the weekly observations that each intern was given by the University supervisors during the spring semester, and the monthly observations given by the mentors and master teachers in both the fall and spring semesters. The initial meeting with the principal, mentor teacher, and the intern by the Coordinator of Fieldwork Experience in the fall was extremely beneficial in establishing that important relationship with the school and the University. From this meeting, the partnership was formed and a relationship developed that allowed for close dialogue and introspection about the interns' progress and needs and allowed for the interns, the schools, and the University to work closely with the intent purpose of intern improvement and satisfaction."

-- University of La Verne

"Collaboration between university and district instructors was another positive aspect of this partnership program. From the inception of the program in Spring 1997, representatives of both institutions shared a vision, discussed program planning, course development, and debriefed on an on-going basis. A bridge was built on both an institutional level and a more personal one-on-one level between the university and school districts relevant to teacher training.

"Interns who have successfully completed the program have done so in two years while teaching full-time. The collaborative program between the university and district offered the best of both worlds. The university was keenly aware of what districts felt new teachers needed, and planned program and coursework accordingly. Instructors were hand-picked to provide the best possible program which bridged theory and research into practice, tailored to the needs of a specific district."

-- CSU Long Beach/Long Beach USD/Norwalk-La Mirada USD Internship Program

"Through careful scheduling, collaboration of topics and hard work, this model is proving to provide a strong, varied pre-service training menu for our interns. This also helps develop relationships between district and university staff that strengthens the team effectiveness on the other grant activities. It is also more cost effective to add to and/or modify existing district pre-training programs than to start new ones. More importantly, this allows support for individual training programs that reflect the individual philosophy of a district that meet the unique cultural and learning needs of their students."

-- Azusa Pacific University/San Gabriel Valley Consortium Internship Program

Delivery of Instruction. Many of the programs try different kinds of instructional delivery systems. All of the programs were concentrating on mixing the theoretical and the practical. As was mentioned earlier, several of the projects draw on the strengths of each partner by co-teaching classes. Some of the projects talked about "spiraling" the curriculum so that each course built on the knowledge learned in the previous course. Nearly all of the programs modified the order of instruction, adjusting to the relative urgencies that interns were facing.

"Integration of theory and practice has been another successful aspect of the

academic program. There is rarely a teacher in the program who doesn't have a classmate at the same school. Their assignments are geared to using their own classrooms as laboratories and observation sites where they can bring the theories and concepts from their courses to life on a daily basis. The academic program also continues to find ways to incorporate district specific information. Methods classes use the district's standards and adoptions. Several classes are taught by experienced Pasadena teachers and others are co-taught by university and school district staff."

-- Pasadena Unified/CSU Dominguez Hills Partnership

Assessment of Performance. Because interns are responsible for the achievement of the students in their classroom, the context for assessment is more authentic than in a student-teaching-based program. The success of the intern can be tied to the success of students in the classroom. Also, in most programs the assessment is done over a longer period of time so that remediation and improvement can be applied and monitored. Most of the programs used more extensive procedures that included case studies, student work and other measures as part of the portfolio assessment process. Most project directors felt that they had a more complete assessment picture on which a more valid judgement could be made.

"As part of their portfolios, interns prepare a video each year to demonstrate their classroom performance. Portfolio Committee members assess each video using a specially-designed rubric. At the end of the first year, interns present their portfolios to the committee which evaluates them using an interview rubric and questionnaire. In the second year, interns participate in the CFASST process. They present their completed portfolios during an exit interview. Interns not meeting program standards may request a one-year extension to complete the requirements."

-- Los Angeles USD LISTOS District Intern Program

"In the area of curriculum, the Intern portfolio has been a successful vehicle to display and assess the Interns' professional growth and development. The portfolio, tied to the California Standards for the Teaching Profession, displays the Intern artifacts which reflect each of the six standards. Through peer review of their portfolios, the Interns give and take ideas from each other and make suggestions for improvement and changes in their completed work."

-- CSU Northridge College of Education, Department of Secondary Education

## Summary

The program continues to meet the goals set by the Legislature and the Commission. The program has expanded the pool of qualified teachers by attracting persons into teaching who might not otherwise enter the classroom. The program has allowed more than four hundred districts to respond immediately to pressing needs for teachers. These interns are able to put their energies directly into their jobs and "learn by doing." Teaching internships allow districts and universities to become partners in teacher preparation to provide high quality, theory based, practically applied instruction, effective supervision, and intensive support so each new intern's learning can be targeted to her/his needs. Educational agencies have offered internships to enable non-traditional candidates to enter the profession. The grant funds provide the means to extend access to those candidates who are not reached by conventional programs and options.

In the six years that the Teaching Internship Program has been in operation growth has occurred in other ways. The expertise about internships and how to make these programs thrive has grown significantly. The program has grown so that there is a 'critical mass' of local and regional expertise so that project personnel can share and support each other in ways that would not have been possible earlier. If this program continues to have high expectations, and, if through the grants that are distributed, districts and colleges and universities provide high quality, focused preparation, then teaching internships will continue to make a significant contribution to the workforce of teachers for the state of California.

Teaching internships continue to be one of the most important means that California is using to meet the need for teachers. Interns bring rich life experiences into the classrooms with them and provide school districts with a teaching population that is significantly more diverse than the graduates of traditional teacher preparation programs. Internships provide

more male teachers for elementary schools, more persons from ethnic and racial groups underrepresented in the teaching workforce, and more teachers who bring rich workplace experiences into California's classrooms after working in other fields.

---



| [Back to the Top](#) |  
| [Back to November 1999 Agenda](#)  
|  
| [Return to "Agenda Archives"](#) |  
| [Return to "About CTC"](#) |





# California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

**Meeting of:** November 3-4, 1999

**Agenda Item Number:** PREP-5

**Committee:** Preparation Standards

**Title:** Proposed Application for Title VII Career Ladder Funding from the U.S. Department of Education

✓ **Action**

**Prepared by:** Phyllis Jacobson, Ed.D., Consultant  
Professional Services Division

---

## Proposed Application for Title VII Career Ladder Funding from the U. S. Department of Education

Professional Services Division  
October 20, 1999

### Executive Summary

The U. S. Department of Education, through its Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (OBEMLA), will likely be making available in late November, 1999, competitive grant funding to support career ladder programs leading to state certification. The proposed Title VII project would augment and complement the state's and the Commission's efforts to address California's teacher shortage by broadening opportunities to participate in paraprofessional teacher training programs that meet Commission standards. The Title VII program would be open to classified school employees who (a) are in job categories ineligible under present state law for participation in the California School Paraprofessional Teacher Training program, and (b) are in districts not part of a California School Paraprofessional Teaching Training Program. This program will represent the efforts and commitment of an northern California collaborative partnership of California State University, Stanislaus, Chico, and Sacramento; San Joaquin Delta, Shasta, and Los Rios Community Colleges; the local school districts in the northern California regions served by these institutions; and the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. The Title VII project will be responsive in particular to the statewide need for qualified K-12 English language development/bilingual teachers. The California State University, Stanislaus, has agreed to be the official applicant on behalf of the partnership (federal regulations require an IHE to be the grantee). Initial contact with the other partner institutions has been positive, and we anticipate commitment to the project once they have had an opportunity to review the grant proposal.

### Policy Issues to be Resolved

Does the Commission wish to authorize the Executive Director to cosponsor an OBEMLA Grant which would enhance the current California School Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program?

### Relationship to the Commission's Strategic Goals and Objectives

**Goal:** Improve the Commission's communication with its stakeholders

**Objectives:** Increase the public relations and visibility of the Commission  
Establish an active positive public information campaign

*Goal:* Work with schools of education, the Department of Education, and school districts to assure quality teachers

*Objective:* Take a leadership role in recruiting and preparing qualified teachers in response to class size reduction

### **Fiscal Impact Statement**

If the grant is awarded, the costs of the Project Director position, and a .50 clerical position would be covered by the grant.

### **Recommendation**

Staff recommends that the Commission authorize the Executive Director to cosponsor an OBEMLA Career Ladder Grant Proposal to enhance the current California School Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program efforts.

## **PROPOSAL OUTLINE**

### **BACKGROUND**

Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act supports grants to state and local educational agencies for the purpose of providing improved instruction to students of limited English proficiency. Competitive grant funds are also available for Career Ladder programs which meet the statutory purpose of "upgrading the qualifications and skills of noncertified educational personnel, especially educational paraprofessionals, to meet high professional standards, including certification and licensure as bilingual teachers and others who serve limited English proficient students, and to help recruit and train secondary students as bilingual education teachers and other educational personnel to serve limited English proficient students" (Reference: CFDA 84.195E). Title VII grants provide five years of funding, at approximately \$200,000-250,000 per year, and the fiscal agent must be a postsecondary institution. Grant applications are likely to be due in Washington on January 10, 2000.

The U.S. Department of Education has typically placed a priority on applications that feature collaboration with local community colleges. Consortium proposals that include collaboration not only with two- and four-year postsecondary institutions, but also with state education agencies, local school districts, community-based organizations, and other professional education organizations are highly encouraged.

Last year, the Commission submitted a similar partnership grant proposal to OBEMLA. This proposal was not funded, and the readers' comments emphasized a perceived need for a more regional focus to the proposal plan. Although the readers acknowledged California's great need for teachers and the appropriateness of the approach taken by the Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program model, it was difficult for readers, most of whom are from IHEs around the nation, to grasp the scope of a project serving an entire state as large as California. In order to address the readers' concerns, and therefore to make the proposal more competitive, we are narrowing the scope of the project to three northern California CSU campuses that already have experience with California's Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program (Stanislaus/Stockton, Chico, and Sacramento), their feeder Community Colleges (San Joaquin Delta, Shasta, and Los Rios) and local school districts. Narrowing our scope will allow us to provide the detail requested by readers as to the characteristics of participating IHEs, school districts, and paraprofessional candidates.

Although California will have just expanded the current Paraprofessional Teacher Training Programs to additional districts around the state, there is still a need for further expansion to include those job categories now excluded from participation under state law (one example of an excluded job classification is Campus Supervisor), and to include paraprofessionals from districts not participating in a PTTP program even after the state's current expansion effort (particularly small, rural districts). These individuals can be recruited and trained as classroom teachers to meet California's increasing need for qualified teachers, in particular for K-12 English language development/bilingual teachers to meet the needs of California's diverse student population.

The project addresses two major goals:

*(1) helping noncertified educational personnel, especially paraprofessionals, to complete baccalaureate and teacher certification programs in order to better serve limited English proficient students; and*

*(2) building a stable statewide infrastructure to ensure that similar opportunities to obtain degrees and teaching certification will continue to be available to interested and qualified paraprofessionals/noncertified educational personnel after the end of federal funding.*

## CONCEPT

We are proposing an expansion and an enhancement of the existing paraprofessional career ladder programs to meet the following statewide needs:

Identified Need	Where We Are	Where We Want To Be
<b>Qualified, certified staff to work with LEP students</b>	Shortage of 27,000 English language development/bilingual staff	An increase of at least 225 certified English language development/bilingual staff
	Despite expansion, current state-funded Paraprofessional career ladder programs around the state can serve only 3,666 participants maximum	Increased number of career ladder programs serving a wider clientele of both paraprofessionals and other noncertified educational staff (increase of 225 total participants served)
<b>Secondary students interested in a career working with LEP students</b>	Future Teacher programs insufficient in number and in funding, and scattered across the state	Expanded Future Teacher programs at a minimum of twenty-five local school districts across the state (emphasis on urban and minority districts)
<b>Improved articulation between local school districts and IHE baccalaureate and teacher credential programs</b>	Coursework not necessarily transferable across IHEs; enrollment, advisement, information and fiscal processes for participants not standardized	Recommended common procedures for enrollment, advisement and fiscal processes for baccalaureate and teacher credential program candidates

## SUMMARY OF PROGRAM PLAN

The Title VII project has four major objectives:

- 1) At least 225 paraprofessionals and other noncertified educational staff working with LEP students will complete a baccalaureate or Master's and a teacher credential program over the five year project period;
- 2) At least 20 secondary student participants in the Title VII program will enter college over the five year project period preparing to become teachers with continuing assistance from the Title VII program;
- 3) The link between undergraduate/5th year/Masters teacher preparation programs will be articulated so that coursework taken at a California community college will satisfy CSU requirements and count towards professional teacher preparation; and a recommended set of statewide fiscal processes for Career Ladder program participants will be provided;
- 4) A statewide network consisting of an interactive web page within the Commission's website on the Internet plus a toll-free telephone number will be established and maintained to connect and coordinate the Title VII program's resources with other existing programs and services for the recruitment, preparation and employment of ELD/bilingual teachers.



The graphic on the following page shows how a Title VII participant will progress through the program services from initial entry through obtaining a teaching credential (Objectives 1 and 2).

For Objective 3, we will address the issue of helping paraprofessionals and other noncertificated staff become knowledgeable about the coursework acceptable for transfer from the two-year community college system to the four-year CSU system's teacher preparation program by making information about the courses that count for the teacher preparation path available on the Commission's website. We will heavily publicize the need for persons interested in teaching as a career to check the list before enrolling in any community college coursework, and by providing accurate listings of the transferable courses between the CC and CSU systems on the website and through the toll-free telephone service. The college/university counselors who work with the Title VII participants in developing and monitoring each individual plan will then be able to provide an accurate educational plan that guarantees smooth transfer to any CSU campus.

We will also be working with the CC and CSU systems to develop and implement standardized fiscal and enrollment procedures for all Title VII participants so that the processes will be similar regardless of what campuses they may be attending.

For Objective 4, we will establish an interactive page within the Commission's website and a toll-free telephone number as described above that will provide on-line information, application forms, links to other related websites, employment connections, and other services useful to paraprofessionals/other noncertified staff interested in becoming teachers.

## **STAFFING**

We envision a full-time project director and a .50 secretary position for the project, paid for out of grant funds.

## **ROLE OF THE COMMISSION IN THE PROJECT**

The Commission has an interest in (a) assuring the quality of all programs preparing California teachers, according to Commission standards; (b) expanding the opportunities for recruiting and preparing teachers to meet the needs of California's diverse students; and (c) fostering collaborative teacher preparation and induction programs between the Commission and California's teacher preparation institutions, including the feeder undergraduate programs at California's two-year institutions.

Within the proposed project, the Commission would provide the program model to be adopted, based on the California School Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program model and approach. Commission staff would also monitor the project to assure the quality of the preparation and the services provided to participants. It is possible that staff from the Commission would serve as the Project Director and/or the secretary for the project. It is also possible that the Commission might serve as the subcontracted fiscal agency for the grant. These arrangements are still under discussion with the partners, as the grant continues to evolve and develop.

## **MAJOR BENEFITS**

- California would become the first state to establish a technology-based link supporting the information needs of paraprofessionals and other noncertified staff interested in becoming teachers. Our site would also be linked to CalTeach and Recruiting New Teachers, Inc., to increase the utility of web-based information about teaching as a career.
  - We would increase the number of California teachers certified to serve the needs of limited English proficient students.
  - We would expand career ladder opportunities to include the participation of other non-certificated staff in addition to paraprofessionals.
  - We would facilitate and standardize statewide interagency school district, community college and CSU processes for initial advisement, enrollment, fiscal, and transfer processes relating to participating career ladder paraprofessionals and other noncertificated staff.
  - We would increase the interest of secondary school students in teaching as a career.
-



| [Back to the Top](#) |

| [Back to November 1999 Agenda](#)

| [Return to "Agenda Archives"](#) |

| [Return to "About CTC"](#) |





# California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

**Meeting of:** November 3-4, 1999

**Agenda Item Number:** PREP-6

**Committee:** Preparation Standards

**Title:** Policy Developments and Issues Related to the Delivery of Instructional Services to English Learners

✓ Information

**Prepared by:** Mary Vixie Sandy, Interim Administrator; and Ellen Venturino, Consultant  
Professional Services Division

---

## Policy Developments and Issues Related to the Delivery of Instructional Services to English Learners

Professional Services Division  
October 21, 1999

### Executive Summary

In August 1997, the Commission adopted the final report of the SB 1422 Advisory Panel which included a recommendation to ensure, through the development of new standards, that all teachers are prepared to teach English learners. Since 1997, several legislative or ballot measures have been enacted that may have a significant impact on the kinds of instructional services provided to these students. This new framework of laws may also have an impact on the preparation needed by teachers to serve English learners.

The current CLAD/BCLAD Credential structure was designed in 1991, prior to the enactment of these measures. As the Commission prepares to adopt new standards for teacher preparation pursuant to SB 2042, it may be timely to review the existing CLAD/BCLAD Credential structure to determine whether it is consistent with the new framework of laws that govern the delivery of services to English learners. The SB 2042 Advisory Panel is developing new standards for teacher preparation programs. The last policy direction the Panel received from the Commission was to address the current CLAD competencies in new standards for all teachers. Pursuant to the new framework of laws in this area, the panel may need further policy direction from the Commission regarding the future preparation of teachers for all students, including English learners. This report provides a brief analysis of the major legislative initiatives that are the basis for a set of policy questions regarding the delivery of instructional services to English learners.

### Policy Question

What is likely to be the most effective structure of teacher preparation, induction and certification to support instructional delivery programs for English Language Learners?

### Fiscal Impact Summary

The costs associated with implementing SB 2042 were estimated to be incurred over two fiscal years, 1998-99 and 1999-2000. The costs are included in the agency's base budget for 1998-99 and 1999-2000.

## Introduction

For over 20 years the Commission on Teacher Credentialing has issued credentials and certificates that authorize the delivery of instructional services to English Language Learners in California public schools. Though the credentials, certificates and standards have changed over the years, the requirement that teachers have specialized preparation to teach English learners has been a constant in Commission policy and regulation, based on Federal and State law. According to a recent California Department of Education Language Census, English Language Learners currently comprise almost 25 percent of all students in California public schools. In response to an increasingly diverse student population, the Commission's SB 1422 Advisory Panel recommended in August 1997 that the Commission incorporate the current knowledge base and field experiences required for the Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development (CLAD) Emphasis Credential into the basic preparation for all teacher candidates. The Commission affirmed this recommendation and forwarded it to the SB 2042 Advisory Panel for the Development of Teacher Preparation Standards.

The Commission's current credential structure includes the CLAD and BCLAD Credentials that have specific authorizations to teach English learners. The primary role of the CLAD Credential holder is to provide English language development (ELD) instruction as well as specially-designed academic instruction in English (SDAIE) to English learners. The BCLAD Credential holder is prepared and authorized to provide the same services as the CLAD Credential holder, and may also use primary language instruction in bilingual education and programs.

Since August 1997, when the Commission adopted the final report of the SB 1422 Advisory Panel, several legislative or ballot measures have been enacted that may require the Commission to rethink the current credential structure with respect to delivery of instructional services to English learners. The following specific measures, enacted during the last two years may have significant implications for the Commission's policies in this area:

- In 1997, then-Governor Wilson signed into law a measure (AB 748, Escutia) requiring the State Board of Education to adopt English Language Development Standards, and the Superintendent of Public Instruction to contract for the development of a test to identify, diagnose and appropriately place English learners.
- In June, 1998, California voters enacted Proposition 227 which required that English learners participate in a structured English language immersion program for a transition period not normally to exceed one year, unless an individual student's parents requested bilingual instruction for the child.
- In July, 1999, the State Board of Education adopted new English Language Development standards designed to assist teachers in moving English learners toward (1) fluency in English and (2) meeting the California Reading-Language Arts Content standards.
- In October 1999, Governor Davis signed SB 638 (Alpert), mandating that school districts use the test developed pursuant to AB 748, in addition to other procedures, to determine whether to reclassify a pupil as proficient in English.
- In October 1999, Governor Davis signed AB 1059 (Ducheney) requiring the Commission to develop new standards for basic teaching credentials, based upon an independent job analysis, for the preparation of teachers for all students, including English Language Learners.

The current CLAD/BCLAD Credential structure was adopted by the Commission in 1992, prior to the enactment of these measures. As the Commission prepares to adopt new standards for teacher preparation, it may be timely to review the existing CLAD/BCLAD Credential structure to determine whether it is consistent with the new framework of laws that govern the delivery of services to English learners. The Commission recently awarded a research contract to WestEd of San Francisco to conduct and report the results of a large-scale analysis of teaching jobs in California public school classrooms, including classes in which English Language Learners are enrolled. Partially on the basis of the job analysis results, the SB 2042 Advisory Panel is developing new standards for teacher preparation programs. The last policy direction the Panel received from the Commission was to address the current CLAD competencies in new standards for all teachers. Pursuant to the new framework of laws in this area, the panel may need further policy direction from the Commission regarding the future preparation of teachers for all students, including English learners. This report provides a brief analysis of the major legislative initiatives that

are the basis for a set of policy questions regarding the delivery of instructional services to English learners.

## **Summary of Recent Legislation**

### *Assembly Bill 748 (Escutia, 1997)*

In 1995, then-Governor Wilson signed legislation (AB 265, Alpert) requiring the development of grade-level pupil content standards in four core K-12 subjects and a new state system for the testing of academic skills. This system requires schools to test all students in specified grades, including English Language Learners, thereby bringing English Language Learners into the state's accountability system. In 1997, he signed legislation authored by Assemblywoman Escutia (AB 748) which requires two significant administrative steps to address specifically the needs and achievement of English Language Learners as they acquire proficiency in English and learn the core curriculum in English.

First, AB 748 requires that the State Board of Education approve pupil Standards for English Language Development that are comparable in rigor and specificity to the Reading Language Arts Standards that have been adopted by the Board for pupils in all grades. Second, AB 748 requires the Superintendent of Public Instruction, with Board approval, to identify or contract for the development of a test or series of tests of English language development. This test is to be used to (1) identify pupils who are limited English proficient and (2) assess their progress in acquiring English proficiency based on levels ranging from *no proficiency* to *fluent proficiency* and including at least two intermediate levels.

### *English Language Development Standards (July 1999)*

English Language Development Standards were approved by the State Board in July 1999. These adopted standards are designed to provide pathways to English proficiency while maintaining each student's progress across the curriculum. These standards supplement the Reading Language Arts Standards so English Language Learners develop proficiency in English language and English literacy. Specifically, the English Language Development Standards address knowledge and skills that English Language Learners must acquire to enable them to meet the Reading Language Arts Standards, regardless of their instructional program, and move into the mainstream English language arts program. The English Language Development Standards integrate listening, speaking, reading, and writing and proposes to create a distinct pathway to reading in English that does not delay instruction in English reading skills.

In October 1999, the State Board of Education awarded a contract for the development of the mandated state assessment of English language development to CTB McGraw Hill. This assessment will be based on the adopted English Language Development Standards, and will be used by school districts to identify, diagnose and reclassify a student from "English learner" to "proficient in English". The California Department of Education expects to pilot this test in the Spring of 2000, and have it available for statewide use during the 2000-01 academic year. A measure introduced in 1999 (SB 638, Alpert) supplements the provisions of AB 748 by mandating that districts use this test as one basis, in addition to other criteria, for classifying and reclassifying English Language Learners.

### *Proposition 227 (June 1998)*

In 1998, the year between the enactment of AB 748 and the adoption of the English Language Development Standards and the associated test contract, Proposition 227 was enacted by the voters. This Proposition spelled out requirements for the instruction of English Language Learners that, while consistent with federal law, were different from preceding state law and policy in key aspects.

Preceding state law, enacted by the Chacone-Moscone Bilingual-Bicultural Act of 1976, required the establishment of bilingual programs to serve English Language Learners and permitted parents to submit a written, signed request to withdraw their child from programs using this method of instruction. This Act sunseted on June 30, 1987, with the provision that funding for the programs would continue to flow to support the program's "general purposes." In Spring 1998, based on a California Superior Court ruling, the State Board of Education rescinded all policies and regulations related to the "general purposes" of prior state law. The board replaced those with a new policy that mirrored federal requirements for education agencies to take "appropriate action" to overcome language barriers that

impede equal participation by students in instructional programs.

As defined in federal law, "appropriate action" does not necessitate primary language instruction or any other specific methodology, but rather is determined by a three-part test that was established in the *Castenda v. Pickard* case to determine whether an education agency is meeting its obligations to English Language Learners. In summary, the three parts require that the program of instruction: (1) be based on some sound education theory, (2) have adequate resources, and (3) be effective in overcoming students' language barriers.

Within this framework of Federal policy, Proposition 227 made significant changes to state law with regard to the instruction of English Language Learners. Specifically, Proposition 227 requires that English Language Learners be taught English by being taught in English. In particular, the measure requires that English Language Learners be placed in English language classrooms where instruction is "overwhelmingly in English" and provided by teachers who possess "a good knowledge of English". In addition, Proposition 227 requires that English Language Learners be taught through "structured English immersion" during a transition period not normally intended to exceed one year.

Schools are bound by these requirements unless parents in sufficient number apply to their school for a waiver and provide prior written informed consent for their children to be placed in a bilingual program (where much of the instruction may be in the primary language) or other program permitted by law. In response to requests from parents, schools *may* transfer English learners to bilingual classes or other programs permitted by law, but schools are required to offer such an alternative program only if twenty or more parental requests are received for pupils in a single grade level.

Compared to prior state law, Proposition 227 changes the "default" or basic program of instruction from bilingual education to structured English immersion. Compared to prior state policy, which did not require schools to provide any particular basic program of instruction, Proposition 227 specifies the basic instructional program and gives parents (not the school) an alternative with a procedure to secure a different program for an English learner.

Structured English immersion is defined in Proposition 227 as an English language acquisition process, designed originally for young children, in which nearly all classroom instruction is in English but the curriculum and presentation are designed for children who are learning the language. Under Proposition 227, "structured English immersion" does not imply a "sink or swim" approach in which children are expected to "pick up" English skills simply by being surrounded by the "sounds of English". A much more effective approach to "structured English immersion" consists of a well-planned curriculum of instruction and practice in English language skills, including literacy skills, provided that the teacher is deeply steeped in the content and pedagogy of these skills. When English learners have acquired a "good working knowledge of English," they are to be transferred to a "mainstream" classroom, which is defined in the Proposition as a classroom in which pupils either are native English speakers or have acquired "reasonable fluency in English."

The terms "good working knowledge of English" and "reasonable fluency in English" are defined in permanent regulations adopted by the State Board of Education in October 1998 as "a reasonable level of English proficiency as it is measured by any of the state-designated assessments approved by the California Department of Education or any locally developed assessments". When it is developed, the AB 748 assessment of English language development will include a performance level to define "reasonable level of English proficiency," which then will prompt the appropriate placement of students in English language mainstream classrooms. Pursuant to State Board policy this "reasonable level of English proficiency" will be at some appropriate level lower than "fluent proficiency".

#### *Assembly Bill 1059 (Duchenev, 1999)*

Assembly Bill 1059 (Ducheny), signed by Governor Davis in early October 1999, requires that in the future, basic teacher preparation programs include preparation to teach all students, including English learners. Currently, basic Multiple and Single Subject Credential Programs do not authorize teachers to serve English learners unless the teachers complete additional requirements in the areas of English language development (ELD) and specially designed academic instruction in English (SDAIE). Specific provisions of AB 1059 are outlined below.

By July 1, 2002, the Commission must ensure that all accredited teacher preparation programs satisfy standards for the preparation of teachers for all pupils, including English Language Learners. The standards must be based upon an independent job analysis of the essential knowledge, skills and abilities needed by all classroom teachers (as opposed to specialist teachers) to assist students to maintain academic progress across the curriculum while continuing to develop English language skills.

AB 1059 further requires the Commission to provide candidates, including out-of-state trained teachers, with an examination route to fulfilling the requirements for teaching English learners. The measure calls for the Commission to complete a comprehensive validity study of the examination route to meeting these requirements.

Beginning July 1, 2003, the Commission may not issue preliminary teaching credentials to applicants unless they have completed the new requirements for preparation to assist English learners in learning English while maintaining progress across the curriculum. In addition, by July 1, 2003, an approved program of beginning teacher induction must satisfy standards for beginning teacher induction for all pupils, including study of knowledge and skills needed by all teachers to assist English learners to access the core curriculum. Consistent with Commission- sponsored legislation in 1998 (SB 2042, Alpert), beginning teacher induction standards must be adopted by the Commission and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Beginning July 1, 2005, the Commission may not initially issue a professional clear teaching credential to an individual unless he/she (1) has completed a beginning teacher induction program that satisfies these standards or (2) already has an authorization to provide services to English learners.

### **Implications for Teacher Preparation and Certification**

The confluence of the three measures summarized above, AB 748, Proposition 227 and AB 1059, suggests a new framework for the preparation of teachers and the delivery of instructional services to English learners. The clear intent of AB 1059 is to ensure that all teachers have adequate preparation to serve English learners, regardless of the types of program the new teachers will deliver. At the same time, AB 748 and Proposition 227 describe a continuum of services to English learners that suggests a need for different levels of preparation for teachers depending on the proficiency levels of students and the types of program they are delivering to English learners.

- The job of providing Structured English Immersion is clearly laid out in AB 748 and Proposition 227 -- teachers are to move students rapidly toward fluency in English and proficiency with the reading language arts curriculum, enabling students to transition as soon as possible into mainstream classrooms. In order to avoid an ineffective "sink or swim" approach to immersion, the preparation needed for this job of teaching must be more rigorous than the current basic teaching credential and may be more intense than the current CLAD preparation.
- Under the new framework of law teachers in "mainstream" classrooms should be expected to teach only those English learners who have attained at least a reasonable level of English fluency as determined by the English language development test. Though transitioning students may need additional instruction and support in English as well as remedial assistance in academic subjects as they move into mainstream classrooms, the primary job of the teacher in this type of classroom is to assist all students in maintaining progress across the curriculum. The preparation needed for this job will most certainly include some, if not all, of the knowledge and skills underlying the current CLAD Credential. More will be known when the current job analysis (SB 2042) as well as the additional job analysis called for in SB 1059 have been completed.
- Teachers in elementary classrooms may have distinctly different preparation needs than teachers in secondary classrooms. It is reasonable to assume that teachers in elementary classrooms will need to have more preparation in English language development than teachers in secondary classrooms, since the K-6 curriculum is highly focused on the overall development of literacy for both English learners and native English speakers. It is also reasonable to assume that for the most part, teachers in departmentalized settings will need to learn to use SDAIE strategies to assist secondary students in accessing the subject matter curriculum. Secondary students who need more focused English language development may need to enroll

in English classes taught by teachers who have specialized preparation in this area.

- School districts offering bilingual programs will continue to need well-qualified teachers to provide core instruction in primary languages, instruction in English language development, and skill transfer from primary language to English until such time as these English learners are transitioned into English-only classrooms. The preparation needed for this job is currently reflected in the Commission's BCLAD standards and examination specifications. The BCLAD - and CLAD - requirements will need to be re-examined in the future to ensure congruence with new state laws, policies and standards.

The two job analyses called for in SB 2042 and AB 1059 will provide the Commission with much more detailed information about the specific and differentiated needs of teachers in multiple types of instructional programs. In April, 1999, the Commission awarded a contract to WestEd to conduct a job analysis to inform the standards and assessments called for in SB 2042. Steps were taken by Commission staff and members of the SB 2042 Advisory Panel to ensure that the job analysis survey included a focus on the knowledge, skills and abilities needed by teachers to teach all students, including English learners. The job analysis is currently underway, and has been tailored to provide the independent basis for the new basic teaching credential standards called for in AB 1059. Staff expect the results of this job analysis to inform the SB 2042 Advisory Panel and the Commission about the knowledge, skills and abilities needed by teachers who serve all students, including English learners. AB 1059 also retains an examination route to meeting the new requirements for teaching English learners, and calls for the Commission to conduct a comprehensive validity study of the current examinations used for this purpose. The Commission has already approved staff recommendations to conduct such a validity study, which will include a job analysis in 2001. This second job analysis will focus specifically on the knowledge, skills and abilities needed by teachers serving English learners in structured English immersion and bilingual programs.

**Policy Questions for Commission Consideration**

The intersection of AB 748, Proposition 227 and AB 1059 raises important policy questions for the Commission to consider:

- What is likely to be the most effective structure of teacher preparation, induction and certification to support the instructional delivery programs that are required by Proposition 227 and AB 748?
- What preparation do teachers need in order to be effective in mainstream classrooms? Is it different from the preparation needed by teachers for Structured English Immersion?
- Should there be any differentiation in the preparation of elementary and secondary teachers for the delivery of instructional services to English learners?
- Should we continue to expect that one preparation option for all teachers will meet the needs of all English learners in the future?
- Is the current CLAD/BCLAD structure designed to meet the needs of all English learners, given the impact of new laws on curriculum and services for this population?
- Should the preparation of bilingual teachers continue to include preparation for English language development?

In the coming months, Commission staff will continue to work with the SB 2042 Advisory Panel to develop standards for the basic Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Credentials that are consistent with new state laws and Commission policies. When the job analysis has been completed by WestEd, the findings will be presented to the Commission and the Panel. These findings will assist the Commission in establishing new policies for the delivery of services to English learners, which will provide important guidance to the Panel as they finalize new teacher preparation standards. In the meantime, members of the Commission and the Panel need to be aware of the potential implications of recent changes in law, which has been the purpose of the present report.







# California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

**Meeting of:** November 3-4, 1999

**Agenda Item Number:** C&CA-1

**Committee:** Credentials and Certificated Assignments

**Title:** Annual Report on the Numbers of Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Credentials Issued by the Commission Upon the Recommendation of California Institutions of Higher Education with Commission-Approved Programs

✓ Information

**Prepared by:** Lillie Ford, Analyst  
Certification, Assignment and Waivers Division

---

## Report on Teachers Credentialed through California Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs)

October 19, 1999

### Summary

This is the second annual report on the numbers of individuals who have completed Commission-approved Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential programs through specific institutions of higher education (IHEs). This agenda item provides the 1997/98 report along with the year to year combined totals beginning with 1990/91 and ending with 1997/98.

### Fiscal Impact Statement

There will be a cost to reproduce and distribute the report. This cost can be absorbed by the current budget.

### Policy Issues to Be Resolved

No policy issues are involved in the production or distribution of this report.

### Background

For the full history of this agenda item please review the original item presented November 18, 1998 which details the history behind this annual report. It was agreed last year that this annual report would be published around the same time each year. Because the review of the data in CAS showed that approximately 99% of the credentials recommended with issuance dates in a specific year have been processed by the end of June the following year, (twelve months after the close of the report year), the reports for 1998-99 will not be completed until July 1, 2000.

---

State of California  
California Commission on Teacher Credentialing  
1997-1998

### **MULTIPLE AND SINGLE SUBJECT TEACHING CREDENTIALS**

Number of First Time/New Type Documents Issued Upon Recommendation  
Table I

The following tables lists the number of Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Credentials that were issued with effective dates between July 1, 1997 and June 30, 1998, upon the

recommendation of a California institution of higher education with a Commission accredited program. It includes candidates for whom this was their first document (first time) and those who had held a different type of document in the past such as an emergency permit (new type). This report counts individuals who earned internship, preliminary, and professional clear credentials.

1997/98 -- First Time/New Type	Single Subject	Multiple Subject	Total
<b>CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY</b>			
Bakersfield	93	249	342
Chico	123	258	381
Dominguez Hills	150	417	567
Fresno	144	494	638
Fullerton	140	376	516
Hayward	223	465	688
Humboldt	72	91	163
Long Beach	212	370	582
Los Angeles	143	427	570
Monterey Bay	0	94	94
Northridge	159	500	659
Pomona	99	230	329
Sacramento	159	354	513
San Bernardino	135	459	594
San Diego	188	364	552
San Diego - Imperial Valley	23	48	71
San Francisco	167	335	502
San Jose	143	283	426
San Luis Obispo	92	88	180
San Marcos	46	285	331
Sonoma	65	102	167
Stanislaus	46	257	303
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,622</b>	<b>6,546</b>	<b>9,168</b>
<b>UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA</b>			
UC Berkeley	29	45	74
UC Davis	34	28	62
UC Irvine	23	63	86
UC Los Angeles	39	120	159
UC Riverside	52	103	155
UC San Diego	45	37	82
UC Santa Barbara	30	52	82
UC Santa Cruz	14	30	44
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>266</b>	<b>478</b>	<b>744</b>
<b>INDEPENDENT INSTITUTIONS</b>			

Azusa Pacific University	81	159	240
Bethany Bible/Assemblies of God	12	45	57
Biola University	12	35	47
California Baptist College	31	51	82
California Lutheran University	20	64	84
Chapman University	489	1,386	1,875
Christian Heritage College	8	18	26
Claremont Graduate School	44	111	155
College of Notre Dame	56	90	146
Concordia University	41	103	144
Dominican College (off Campus)	11	28	39
Dominican College of San Rafael	42	108	150
Fresno Pacific University	28	73	101
Holy Names College	12	25	37
Hope International University	0	6	6
John F. Kennedy University	10	28	38
La Sierra University	7	26	33
Loyola Marymount University	31	55	86
Mills College	18	20	38
Mount St. Mary's College	24	17	41
National Hispanic University	0	9	9
National University	482	1,201	1,683
New College of California	0	21	21
Occidental College	15	23	38
Pacific Oaks College	0	36	36
Pacific Union College	12	12	24
Pattern College	0	25	25
Pepperdine University - Los Angeles	18	89	107
Pepperdine University - Malibu	5	27	32
Point Loma Nazarene U - Pasadena	18	11	29
Point Loma Nazarene University	33	67	100
Santa Clara University	2	38	40
Simpson College	19	88	107
Southern California College	15	35	50
St. Mary's College of California	44	130	174
Stanford University	76	0	76
The Master's College	11	20	31
U.S. International University	20	54	74
University of La Verne	43	107	150

University of Redlands	44	181	225
University of San Diego	48	104	152
University of San Francisco	9	36	45
University of Southern California	17	70	87
University of the Pacific	40	77	117
Westmont College	9	8	17
Whitter College	28	41	69
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,985</b>	<b>4,958</b>	<b>6,943</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>4,873</b>	<b>11,982</b>	<b>16,855</b>
CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING			

State of California  
California Commission on Teacher Credentialing  
1997-1998  
**MULTIPLE AND SINGLE SUBJECT TEACHING CREDENTIALS**  
Total Number of Documents Issued Upon Recommendation  
Table II

The following table lists the number of Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Credentials that were issued with effective dates between July 1, 1997 and June 30, 1998, upon the recommendation of a California institution of higher education with a Commission accredited program. It includes candidates for whom this was their first document (first time), those who have held a different type of document in the past such as an emergency permit (new type), and those who are renewing this document as from preliminary to professional clear. This report counts individuals who earned internship, preliminary, and professional clear credentials.

1997/98 - All Types	Single Subject	Multiple Subject	Total
<b>CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY</b>			
Bakersfield	185	407	592
Chico	133	272	405
Dominguez Hills	253	602	855
Fresno	223	791	1,014
Fullerton	255	536	791
Hayward	317	631	948
Humboldt	85	118	203
Long Beach	366	595	961
Los Angeles	210	550	760
Monterey Bay	0	96	96
Northridge	295	759	1,054
Pomona	173	357	530
Sacramento	274	611	885
San Bernardino	218	672	890
San Diego	288	524	812
San Diego - Imperial Valley	36	73	109
San Francisco	275	502	777

San Jose	225	391	616
San Luis Obispo	141	128	269
San Marcos	67	403	470
Sonoma	117	184	301
Stanislaus	115	438	553
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4,251</b>	<b>9,640</b>	<b>13,891</b>
<b>UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA</b>			
UC Berkeley	32	48	80
UC Davis	38	33	71
UC Irvine	51	135	186
UC Los Angeles	54	170	224
UC Riverside	64	131	195
UC San Diego	49	43	92
UC Santa Barbara	33	54	87
UC Santa Cruz	19	43	62
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>340</b>	<b>657</b>	<b>997</b>
<b>INDEPENDENT INSTITUTIONS</b>			
Azusa Pacific University	128	224	352
Bethany Bible/Assemblies of God	18	57	75
Biola University	20	45	65
California Baptist College	41	71	112
California Lutheran University	54	105	159
Chapman University	766	2,115	2,881
Christian Heritage College	9	21	30
Claremont Graduate School	44	114	158
College of Notre Dame	60	97	157
Concordia University	49	134	183
Dominican College (off Campus)	14	42	56
Dominican College of San Rafael	57	128	185
Fresno Pacific University	56	153	209
Holy Names College	14	33	47
Hope International University	0	6	6
John F. Kennedy University	10	29	39
La Sierra University	12	36	48
Loyola Marymount University	44	86	130
Mills College	21	25	46
Mount St. Mary's College	29	24	53
National Hispanic University	0	10	10
National University	616	1,482	2,098

New College of California	0	23	23
Occidental College	15	23	38
Pacific Oaks College	0	44	44
Pacific Union College	13	21	34
Pattern College	0	30	30
Pepperdine University - Los Angeles	26	113	139
Pepperdine University - Malibu	10	32	42
Point Loma Nazarene U - Pasadena	28	16	44
Point Loma Nazarene University	70	166	236
Santa Clara University	6	42	48
Simpson College	20	94	114
Southern California College	24	53	77
St. Mary's College of California	51	145	196
Stanford University	78	1	79
The Master's College	17	27	44
U.S. International University	25	69	94
University of La Verne	93	185	278
University of Redlands	79	249	328
University of San Diego	67	153	220
University of San Francisco	21	61	82
University of Southern California	26	85	111
University of the Pacific	62	120	182
Westmont College	12	16	28
Whitter College	41	77	118
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,846</b>	<b>6,882</b>	<b>9,728</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>7,437</b>	<b>17,179</b>	<b>24,616</b>
CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING			

## California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

### Year-by-Year Comparison

#### MULTIPLE AND SINGLE SUBJECT TEACHING CREDENTIALS

Total Number of Documents Issued upon Recommendation

**TABLE III**

The following table lists the number of Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Credentials that were issued with effective dates in the fiscal years indicated, upon the recommendation of a California institution of higher education with a Commission-approved/accredited program. It includes candidates for whom this was their first document (first time), those who have held a different type of document in the past such as an emergency permit (new type), and those who are renewing this document as from preliminary to professional clear.

#### CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

	1990-91	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98
Bakersfield	375	395	432	434	487	483	456	592
Chico	506	466	351	350	335	310	349	405
Dominguez Hills	432	694	737	731	632	745	825	855
Fresno	930	1,130	931	883	842	846	918	1014
Fullerton	566	621	557	640	661	611	696	791
Hayward	515	522	514	544	541	554	689	948
Humboldt	201	204	192	207	166	232	186	203
Long Beach	737	872	1,008	890	896	850	826	961
Los Angeles	743	751	637	645	646	668	652	760
Monterey Bay	0	0	0	0	0	9	14	96
Northridge	811	805	897	752	882	834	873	1054
Pomona	365	378	426	451	443	432	362	530
Sacramento	745	866	823	870	781	886	796	885
San Bernardino	750	829	848	795	695	742	622	890
San Diego	819	799	691	759	718	702	649	812
San Diego - Imperial Valley	63	61	103	108	94	96	122	109
San Francisco	698	818	796	778	687	769	827	777
San Jose	626	708	652	626	552	526	522	616
San Luis Obispo	345	361	286	280	264	244	273	269
San Marcos	38	76	138	191	273	349	363	470
Sonoma	336	423	335	313	317	277	283	301
Stanislaus	367	509	471	437	408	455	433	553
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>10,968</b>	<b>12,288</b>	<b>11,825</b>	<b>11,684</b>	<b>11,320</b>	<b>11,620</b>	<b>11,736</b>	<b>13,891</b>
<b>UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA</b>								
	1990-91	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98
UC Berkeley	71	89	45	41	23	37	61	80
UC Davis	124	125	100	95	95	83	71	71
UC Irvine	290	348	306	263	278	230	221	186
UC Los Angeles	194	248	212	160	21	144	121	224
UC Riverside	275	235	198	210	143	176	168	195
UC San Diego	82	126	103	99	95	54	139	92
UC Santa Barbara	113	124	104	97	88	98	89	87
UC Santa Cruz	124	132	123	77	79	74	69	62
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,273</b>	<b>1,427</b>	<b>1,191</b>	<b>1,042</b>	<b>822</b>	<b>896</b>	<b>939</b>	<b>997</b>
<b>INDEPENDENT INSTITUTIONS</b>								
	1990-91	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98



Azusa Pacific University	146	180	176	279	280	275	358	352
Bethany College/Assemblies of God	28	28	38	46	64	60	58	75
Biola University	61	56	63	66	65	71	62	65
California Baptist College	24	40	27	62	53	54	61	112
California Lutheran University	237	227	191	181	171	178	160	159
Chapman University	1,047	1,491	1,566	1,716	1,820	1,881	2,107	2,881
Christian Heritage College	11	19	13	35	18	34	19	30
Claremont Graduate School	137	176	192	171	170	180	164	158
College for Developmental Studies	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
College of Notre Dame	70	119	106	135	139	144	175	157
Concordia University	34	26	68	91	157	192	158	183
Dominican College of San Rafael	141	170	156	124	133	142	133	185
Dominican College (Off Campus)	0	0	14	49	42	50	58	56
Fresno Pacific University	268	230	223	232	206	187	182	209
Holy Names College	28	60	44	48	60	54	70	47
Hope International University	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6
John F. Kennedy University	8	16	14	19	13	19	25	39
La Sierra University	9	41	45	52	39	32	41	48
Loma Linda University	28	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Loyola Marymount University	147	130	120	107	132	125	93	130
Mills College	48	34	44	70	46	52	49	46
Mount St. Mary's College	45	47	38	42	68	61	52	53
National Hispanic University	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	10
National University	1,120	1,231	1,316	1,463	1,508	1,595	1,674	2,098
New College of California	0	0	0	0	15	11	15	23
Occidental College	15	13	11	13	23	18	29	38
Pacific Oaks College	46	61	39	58	50	30	44	44

Pacific Union College	27	35	23	31	44	18	30	34
Patten College	1	4	4	23	12	9	14	30
Pepperdine University - Los Angeles	51	77	90	106	110	146	143	139
Pepperdine University - Malibu	49	25	55	36	38	35	42	42
Point Loma Nazarene University	213	256	319	292	238	246	215	236
Point Loma Nazarene U - Pasadena	0	0	0	0	0	25	31	44
Santa Clara University	35	26	38	38	38	49	47	48
Simpson College	25	54	70	73	97	98	112	114
Southern California College	67	90	82	57	71	62	62	77
St. Mary's College of California	149	149	123	237	227	214	191	196
Stanford University	82	94	90	139	110	96	98	79
The Master's College	18	34	36	34	58	45	36	44
U.S. International University	143	113	87	89	99	85	59	94
University of La Verne	70	138	155	199	199	247	230	278
University of Redlands	130	170	197	208	234	263	304	328
University of San Diego	134	141	163	192	190	195	196	220
University of San Francisco	54	80	70	73	65	66	66	82
University of Southern California	99	126	113	106	87	124	109	111
University of the Pacific	212	214	178	174	197	179	152	182
Westmont College	32	34	33	23	28	18	38	28
Whittier College	55	75	94	100	103	101	107	118
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>5,361</b>	<b>6,331</b>	<b>6,525</b>	<b>7,289</b>	<b>7,517</b>	<b>7,766</b>	<b>8,082</b>	<b>9,728</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>17,602</b>	<b>20,046</b>	<b>19,541</b>	<b>20,015</b>	<b>19,659</b>	<b>20,282</b>	<b>20,757</b>	<b>24,616</b>



[Back to the Top](#) |  
[Back to November 1999 Agenda](#) |  
[Return to "Agenda Archives"](#) |  
[Return to "About CTC"](#) |





# California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

**Meeting of:** November 3-4, 1999

**Agenda Item Number:** C&CA-2

**Committee:** Credentials and Certificated Assignments

**Title:** Recommended Policy Related to the Teaching of Struggling Readers

✓ Action

**Prepared by:** Terri Fesperman, Analyst, Certification, Assignment and Waivers Division, and  
Ellen Venturing, Consultant, Professional Services Division

---

## Recommended Policy Related to the Teaching of Struggling Readers

**October 19, 1999**

### Summary

A student's success in school and often later in the work world depends greatly on the mastery of reading skills and reciprocal skills in language arts. Research tells us that students who receive adequate instruction and intervention in their early years have excellent chances of becoming competent readers. The need for an additional level of reading intervention which occurs outside the classroom with the aid of a specialist was affirmed in *Teaching Reading*, a program advisory jointly issued by the State Board of Education, Superintendent of Public Instruction, California Department of Education, and this Commission. The advisory, issued in 1996, was intended to provide policy direction and instructional guidance in the development and implementation of a balanced and comprehensive reading program and was informed by significant new research on how children best learn to read.

The need for specialized assistance to struggling readers by teachers with specialized training was affirmed again through enactment of legislation requiring the Commission to establish Standards for a Reading Certificate which contain, as specified, the necessary preparation for teachers to provide an effective intervention program for struggling readers. The Commission developed and adopted Standards for the Reading Certificate in August 1998. A task force has been convened to review colleges and universities' response to the Standards. Staff anticipate that the first of many programs will be recommended for initial accreditation in January or February 2000.

### Fiscal Impact

This agenda item has no fiscal impact.

### Policy Issue to be Resolved

Does the Commission wish to adopt a policy to the effect that the preparation for a Commission-adopted Reading Certificate provides the knowledge, skills and specialization needed to provide specialized assistance to struggling readers? Having a statement of this nature would anchor staff efforts in the months ahead as we explore various preparation options and obstacles to implementing any assignment requirement similar to the one presented earlier this year to the Commission in proposed regulations.

## Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Commission adopt a policy statement to the effect that preparation for the Commission-adopted Reading Certificate provides the knowledge, skills, and specialization necessary to provide specialized assistance to struggling readers and to assist their teachers.

## Background

A student's success in school and often later in the work world depends greatly on the mastery of reading skills and reciprocal skills in language arts. Reading is the most fundamental skill that students learn in school. It is through proficient reading that students are able to access the content of other school subjects and reach beyond to the world's wealth in knowledge. Without reading proficiency, students are hampered in every-day functioning in and out of school, limited in work potential, and are withheld the pleasure of literature and the satisfaction inherent in the pursuit and mastery of knowledge.

Research tells us that students who receive adequate instruction and intervention in their early years have excellent chances of becoming competent readers. With further instruction, proficient readers can continue to develop their reading and writing skills to become highly competent in reading comprehension, written composition, and mature use of the English language. Students who do not receive adequate services at an early age have much less chance of achieving competence.

California has a long history of responding to the needs of readers struggling for competence. In the 1960's, California enacted the Miller-Unruh Reading Act of 1965 through which the State funded reading programs in the primary grades to provide specialized diagnostic services and supplemental, remedial instruction to struggling readers. The program distributes funding as a matching grant with districts to pay for positions filled by holders of either the Miller Unruh Reading Specialist Certificate or the Reading Specialist Credential [and successor credentials] who are relieved of regular classroom assignments and provide reading services on a full-time, pull-out basis.

The Miller-Unruh program sunset on June 30, 1987 with the provision that funding for the program would continue to flow to support the program's "general purposes" which were to provide a "reading instruction program directed to the prevention of, and the correction of, reading disabilities at the earliest possible time in the educational career of the pupil." Along with the program, the Commission's authority to issue Miller-Unruh Reading Certificates also sunset, forcing prospective Miller-Unruh teachers to earn a reading specialist credential or serve on a waiver. Since the sunset, funding for the program has continued but increases have not kept pace with the increasing number of students in need of specialized instruction.

In 1994, the Superintendent of Public Instruction assembled the California Reading Task Force to examine reading instruction in California's schools and to make recommendations for instruction in the future. This thorough examination was in response to a decline in California students' reading test scores and an increased concern among parents and educators. In 1995, the Task Force issued a report entitled *Every Child a Reader* in which the Task Force concluded that the 1987 *English Language Arts Framework* did not present a comprehensive and balanced reading program with sufficient attention to the systematic instruction of skills. It was determined that a balanced and comprehensive approach to reading must have the following elements:

- A strong literature, language, and comprehension program that includes the balance of oral and written language;
- An organized, explicit skills program that includes phonemic awareness, phonics and decoding skills to address the needs of emergent readers;
- Ongoing diagnosis that informs teaching and assessment that ensures accountability; and
- A powerful early intervention program that provides individual tutoring for children at-risk of reading failure.

In the following year, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the California Department of Education, the State Board of Education, and the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing collaborated with "uncommon consensus" to develop *Teaching Reading*, a program advisory on early reading instruction that was jointly issued in direct response to

*Every Child a Reader*. The advisory, issued in 1996, was intended to provide policy direction and instructional guidance in the development and implementation of a balanced and comprehensive reading program in grades K-3. The intent was to support the improvement of early reading achievement in California schools and form the basis for their plans and activities involving reading such as those related to Title I, child development, and English language learners, among others.

The advisory, as was *Every Child a Reader*, was informed by significant new research on how children best learn to read. Among the most notable, was the research sponsored by the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, an education research program initiated in 1965 to focus on reading difficulties, when it became clear how extensive the reading problem was in the general population. The advisory stated that "there is sufficient guidance now available from research about how children best learn to read and about how successful reading programs work to ensure that virtually every child will learn to read well, at least by the end of third grade. This advisory is offered in support of that goal."

According to research, fully 20 percent of students (including learning disabled students) encounter some difficulty with early reading and depend critically on explicit assistance with phonemic awareness. In the concluding sections, the Reading Advisory also recognized that children arrive at school as individuals with literacy experiences ranging from zero to 2000 hours. Some arrive not speaking English. For this reason, the Reading Advisory gave standing to Task Force recommendation 3 that: "Schools must have an effective, rigorous, proven intervention program as part of their comprehensive literacy plan for instruction, with an emphasis on early intervention of children by mid-first grade."

The Reading Advisory explicated this recommendation by stating that the "first level of intervention is the classroom with a powerful program of rich language and instruction ... and...differential treatment of children by the teacher should be the first response. ***A second level of intervention occurs outside the classroom. Participation in such intervention often is preceded by more formal diagnostic measures and assessments conducted by specialists or by a Student Study Team process (emphasis added)***... Categorical programs and the funds associated with them also represent a source of support for in-class supplemental help, pullout, before- and after-school, intersession, and, summer school programs."

One reading specialist who works with children at a school site and has provided years of service to the Commission on various panels describes the intervention that some children need outside the classroom as being instruction that is "more intense, more focused, and proceeds at a different, generally slower, pace" than what occurs in the classroom. Such interventions rely on a larger repertoire of assessment tools, diagnosis ability, and intervention strategies than is provided to classroom teachers in preservice training.

The Reading Advisory identified characteristics of the most effective interventions as among which are those that are applied as early as possible in a child's educational career (but not before there has been an opportunity for effective classroom instruction to be tried first) and those that involve well-trained specialists.

At the same time the state agencies were issuing their joint program advisory, the California Reading Initiative began to take form, championed by then Governor Wilson. Through this initiative, the State made a major commitment to improve the basic reading skills of all K-12 pupils. Sponsored by the Governor and supported by the Commission, Legislature, State Board of Education, Superintendent of Public Instruction, leaders in the California State University system, and many education associations, the California Reading Initiative encompassed a multi-faceted strategy with six major components:

- Class-size reduction in grades K-3 to give pupils the individual attention they need to develop foundation skills.
- Selection of new reading material that represent a balanced, comprehensive approach to literacy education.
- Provision of new reading materials to every student in the primary grades.
- Provision of comprehensive leadership training to school board members, school and district administrators, and lead teachers.
- Provision of professional development to all K-8 teachers in a balanced, comprehensive approach to reading instruction.
- Improvement in the preservice preparation of teacher candidates in reading

instruction.

In April 1996, the Commission responded to the call for action by convening an Advisory Task Force on Teacher Preparation for Reading to examine and make recommendations to the Commission in three areas of current preparation as they relate to the teaching of reading. These areas included the: (1) content of preservice reading courses, (2) preparation Standards for the basic credential programs, and (3) preparation Standards for the Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential.

In addition, the task force was charged with recommending Standards and requirements for a new Reading Certificate to prepare teachers to work as site leaders in reading, in school site pull-out programs, and to provide an appropriate level of preparation for the 300 Miller-Unruh teachers then serving with waivers.

***The goal of this process was to create a cohesive system of Standards and a continuum of Standards-based preparation, beginning with the essential knowledge and skill required to provide balanced, comprehensive instruction in reading and language arts, and continuing with more advanced and specialized teacher preparation needed for work with students who need intensive interventions.***

The work of the task force was guided further by the enactment of Assembly Bill 3075 (Chapter 921, Statutes of 1996, Baldwin) and Senate Bill 1568 (Chapter 1068, Statutes of 1996, Dills). AB 3075 required that preparation for the basic credentials include preparation for reading instruction that is research-based and includes:

- The study of organized, systematic, explicit skills including (a) phonemic awareness, (b) direct, systematic, explicit phonics, and (c) decoding;
- A strong literature, language, and comprehension component with a balance of oral and written language;
- Ongoing diagnostic techniques that inform teaching and assessment
- Early intervention techniques; and
- Guided practice in a clinical setting.

SB 1568 required the establishment of a Reading Certificate to prepare holders of a teaching credential to "provide the early and continuing development of reading and language arts skills and the earliest possible correction of a pupil's reading difficulties." In addition, this measure required the preparation Standards to include demonstrated knowledge of the following, accompanied by guided practice in a clinical setting:

- Current and confirmed research in the teaching of basic reading skills, including research in ongoing, diagnostic techniques that inform teaching and assessment.
- Techniques for teaching basic reading skills that include direct instruction in phonemic awareness; direct, systematic, explicit phonics (defined as spelling patterns, the direct instruction of sound and symbol relationships, and practice in reading connected, decodable text); and comprehension skills.
- Early intervention techniques

The task force conceptualized and presented to the Commission a three-stage system of comprehensive Standards-based preparation for the delivery of reading instruction to students in the public schools. The task force proposed a model that emphasized the interdependent roles of the: (1) classroom teacher who would provide classroom assessment and a balanced, comprehensive program of reading instruction informed by assessment, (2) reading certificate holder who would be authorized in K-12 to provide more indepth assessment, diagnosis, and instruction of struggling readers at the school site and/or assist site teachers in better adapting instruction to the needs of struggling readers, and (3) district-level specialist in reading and language arts who would play a leadership role at the district level with emphasis on textbook and materials evaluation and selection, sequencing, articulation, and coordination of instruction, program selection and evaluation, and providing staff development in reading.

In design, the Standards for the Reading Certificate were developed at an advanced level of the reading Standard in the basic credential program to enable holders to serve the needs of struggling readers. The advisory, issued in 1996, was intended to provide policy direction and instructional guidance in the development and implementation of a balanced and comprehensive reading program in grades K-3., and were nested within the Standards for the specialist credential. The authorization represented a change from the Miller-Unruh

Certificate authorization, which was limited to the primary grades, and differed from many staff development programs which focused on struggling readers in only one or more early grades.

By September 1998, the task force's work was complete, and the Commission had taken action on its recommendations and had adopted new Standards for the teaching of reading in preparation programs for the basic Multiple Subject and Single Subject Credential, Reading Certificate, and the Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential. The Commission also approved the basic design and authorization scheme envisioned by the task force. Finally, the Commission approved regulations which permitted candidates to complete course work in specified areas of study by June 30, 2000 and apply directly to the Commission for a reading certificate.

In March 1999, the Executive Director sent a letter to the colleges and universities inviting them to respond to the new Reading Certificate and Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential Standards. To date, staff have received nine proposals and as many or more inquiries from interested colleges and universities. A task force of reading experts was assembled and is reviewing proposals. We anticipate that the first of many proposals will be recommended for initial accreditation by January or February of 2000.

### **Proposed Regulations--Timeline for Resolving Key Issues.**

At the February and March, 1999 Commission meetings, staff presented proposed additions to Title 5 Regulations (Sections 80014.3 and 80066) pertaining to the Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential and teaching struggling readers on a basic teaching credential. The proposed regulations included an authorization statement and requirements for the Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential. There was no opposition to this section of the regulations. The proposed regulations also included an authorization statement for teaching struggling readers on a basic teaching credential. Individuals responded both in favor and in opposition to this section.

The public hearing on these two sections of regulations was held on June 3, 1999. Staff presented a summary of the responses both in favor and in opposition to the proposed regulations. The concerns raised at the public hearing were the following: 1) the capacity of the Reading Certificate programs (when and where they will be offered), 2) the implementation date of the regulations was seen as too soon given the capacity issue, 3) the grandparenting clause did not include part-time teaching experience equivalency, 4) the possibility that course work completed at the new California Reading Professional Development Institutes would be acceptable toward the Reading Certificate needed to be researched, and 5) the flexibility to use alternative training options (such as district staff development programs) needed to be explored. The Commission voted at the June meeting to postpone the public hearing for a minimum of 90 days to allow Commission staff time to discuss the concerns raised with representatives from the field.

Commission staff has met with constituent groups and would like more time to continue the discussion. At the November 4<sup>th</sup> Commission meeting, staff intends to present only Section 80066 for public hearing and recommend withdrawing the section of regulations (Section 80014.3) pertaining to teaching struggling readers on a basic teaching credential. By withdrawing this one section of the proposed regulations, it allows Commission staff the time to discuss the regulations with representatives from the field. There are no new requirements in the proposed regulations for the Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential and there was no opposition to this section of regulations on the authorization or requirements for the credential at the June public hearing.

In Exhibit A on the following page is a chart with a proposed timeline outlining the steps the Commission staff plans to take to formulate the reading regulations.

In October, Commission staff surveyed the credential analysts attending the Credential Counselors and Analysts of California Conference concerning the institution's interest in submitting a Reading Certificate program proposal and the local interest in such a program. Some of the credential analysts waited to respond to the survey until they returned to their campus. Commission staff will provide an update on the survey by the November 4<sup>th</sup> Commission meeting.

In November, staff plans to meet with reading/curriculum specialists, survey the university

deans regarding offering course work for the Reading Certificate program, discuss budget proposals for incentives for the certificate with representatives from the Governor's office, and work with the California Reading Professional Development Institutes concerning their first year and the type of course work credit, if any, that is being offered by the program toward the Reading Certificate.

Commission staff plans to examine alternative routes to teach reading to struggling readers and also meet with representatives from the county and school district personnel offices in December. In February 2000, staff plans to present an information agenda item including proposed language for regulations for teaching struggling readers and follow with an action item in March asking to set a public hearing date for the proposed regulations.

The issue to be resolved today is as follows: Does the Commission wish to adopt a policy to the effect that the preparation for a Commission-adopted Reading Certificate provides the specialization necessary to provide specialized assistance to struggling readers? Having a statement of this nature would anchor staff efforts in the months ahead as we explore various preparation options and obstacles to implementing any assignment requirement similar to the one presented in proposed regulations earlier this year and discussed above. We recommend that, consistent with its past actions in the area of reading preparation, the Commission adopt such a policy statement.

Timeline Chart







| [Back to the Top](#) |

| [Back to November 1999 Agenda](#)

| [Return to "Agenda Archives"](#) |

| [Return to "About CTC"](#) |





# California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

**Meeting of:** November 3-4, 1999

**Agenda Item Number:** C&CA-3

**Committee:** Credentials and Certificated Assignments

**Title:** Demonstration of the Commission's Automated Phone System (CAPS)

✓ Action

**Prepared by:** Dale Janssen, Manager

Certification, Assignment and Waivers Division

---

## Demonstration of the Commission's Automated Phone System (CAPS)

October 19, 1999

### Summary

On October 8, 1999, the Certification, Assignment and Waivers Division implemented a new automated phone system and toll-free number. This system allows access to the Credential Automation System (CAS) so Commission agencies and applicants may determine the status of an application or hear valid credentials on file at the Commission. These same agencies and applicants are now able to contact the Commission toll-free from anywhere within the United States by calling 888-921-2682 or within the 916 area code 445-7254.

### Features of CAPS

The new system contains the following features:

- 16 incoming phone lines (10 lines in the old system)
- Access 24-hours, 7 days a week
- New, shorter, clearer messages
- Voice mail for ordering applications, professional growth manuals and credential information
- Automated status checks for applications and valid credentials
- Access to certification officers weekdays between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m.

The new main menu allows the caller to select from six options: 1) status of an application or credential; 2) ordering an application or professional growth manual; 3) obtain general information about California credentials and about the Commission; 4) information on specific credentials; 5) examination information; and 6) access to a certification officer.

### Benefits of CAPS

The new phone system benefits the Commission's external customers by giving them access to CAS. This will eliminate the need for lookup faxes and phone calls. Staff anticipates that access to CAS will answer 45% of the 5,000 current calls answered by the call center each month. It also allows individuals calling the Commission to obtain credential information by leaving their name and address so staff can in turn send detailed information. The new system also makes it easier to access certification officers. With the status and credential information calls being answered by automation, it is anticipated that certification officers should have more time to answer detailed credential questions.

The new system allows staff to generate reports that count incoming calls, provides a profile of answered calls, provides the number of abandoned calls, reports the average time of all calls, and generates a report that tracks all calls through the automated system. CAPS also provides management with real-time data alerting the supervisor at times when calls exceed the 5-minute waiting period.

---

## **CAPS\* PHONE TREE 10/12/99**

(16 incoming lines)

### **1. STATUS OF APPLICATION OR CREDENTIAL**

- ↳ 1. Application → **Database**
- 2. Credentials Held → **Database**

### **2. ORDERING APPLICATION OR PG MANUAL**

- ↳ 1. Renewal Application → **Leave Name and Address**
- 2. First-Time Credential Application → **Leave Name and Address**
- 3. Professional Growth Manual → **Leave Name and Address**

### **3. GENERAL INFORMATION**

- ↳ 1. Brochure → **Leave Name and Address**
- 2. Fees → **Recorded Message**
- 3. Employment (Cal Teach) → **Recorded Message**
- 4. How to Contact CTC → **Recorded Message**

### **4. SPECIFIC CREDENTIALS**

- ↳ 1. Multiple/Single Subject
  - ↳ 1. Out of State → **Leave Name and Address**
  - 2. CA → **Leave Name and Address**
- 2. Special Education
  - ↳ 1. Out of State → **Leave Name and Address**
  - 2. CA → **Leave Name and Address**
- 3. Service → **Leave Name and Address**
- 4. Other Teaching
  - ↳ 1. Child Development → **Leave Name and Address**
  - 2. Adult/Voc → **Leave Name and Address**
- 5. Out of Country → **Leave Name and Address**

### **5. EXAMS**

- ↳ 1. CBEST
  - 2. MS
  - 3. SS
  - 4. RICA
  - 5. CLAD/BCLAD
- } **All End  
With "Call  
Testing  
Agency"**

### **6. TO SPEAK TO A CERTIFICATION OFFICER**

**9 = RETURN TO THE MAIN MENU**

**# = Repeats Current Menu**

\*CAPS stands for Credentialing Automated Phone System



| [Back to the Top](#) |  
| [Back to November 1999 Agenda](#)  
| [Return to "Agenda Archives"](#) |  
| [Return to "About CTC"](#) |





# California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

**Meeting of:** November 3-4, 1999

**Agenda Item Number:** PUB-1

**Title:** Proposed Addition of Section 80014.3 and Amendment to Section 80066 of Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Concerning Teaching of Reading as a Separate Subject on a Basic Teaching Credential and the Reading and Language Arts Specialist Teaching Credential

✓ Action

**Prepared by:** Terri Fesperman, Program Analyst  
Certification, Assignment and Waivers Division

---

## PUBLIC HEARING

**November 4, 1999**

### **Proposed Addition of Section 80014.3 and Amendment to Section 80066 of Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Concerning Teaching of Reading as a Separate Subject on a Basic Teaching Credential and the Reading and Language Arts Specialist Teaching Credential**

#### **Introduction**

The proposed addition of Section 80014.3 and amendment to Section 80066 pertaining to the Teaching of Reading as a Separate Subject on a Basic Teaching Credential and the Reading and Language Arts Specialist Teaching Credential are being presented for public hearing. The public hearing was originally opened on June 3, 1999, at which time the Commission voted to delay the public hearing for a minimum of 90 days. This is the resumption of that public hearing. Included in this item is the background of the proposed regulations, a brief discussion of the proposed changes, and the financial impact. Also included are the responses to the notification of the public hearing and a copy of the notification distributed in Coded Correspondence [99-9910](#) dated April 16, 1999 and the announcement of the resumption of the public hearing in Coded Correspondence [99-9921](#) dated October 8, 1999.

Staff is recommending that Section 80014.3 be withdrawn from consideration at this public hearing. There has been a strong response from the field expressing concerns over the implementation of this section of regulations.

#### **Background of the Proposed Regulations**

Education Code Section 44225(e) requires the Commission to "determine the scope and authorization of credentials, to ensure competence in teaching and other educational services, and establish sanctions for the misuse of credentials and the misassignment of credential holders." In carrying out these duties, staff has found that some sections of the Education Code and Title 5 regulations pertaining to assignment are sufficiently vague to create confusion or allow questionable interpretation among educational employers. Staff proposed at the August 1998 Commission meeting a general plan to clarify in regulations those areas pertaining to assignment that are open to misinterpretation. These regulations were presented as an information item at the February 1999 Commission meeting.

#### **Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential**

The Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential Program, approximately thirty semester

units of course work, prepares individuals to play a leadership role at the school site, the school district, or the county office of education. There is an emphasis on working with students experiencing serious difficulties with reading and on offering decision-making and research skills and abilities that affect programmatic decisions. A basic teaching credential is a prerequisite to the specialist credential. Reading and Language Arts Specialists are prepared to work with students in multiple settings and to perform multiple roles including developing and coordinating school site, district, or county level reading programs, providing assistance and support for the classroom teacher, selecting and adapting instructional programs, planning and conducting staff development, and assessing student progress and monitoring achievement.

The Commission's Advisory Task Force developed *Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness for the Reading Certificate and for the Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential*. The Reading Certificate portion of the Standards was designed to comprise the first half of a full Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential Program. This "nesting" of standards allows individuals to apply course work obtained in pursuit of a Certificate toward completion of the specialist credential.

The Task Force on Reading Instruction also examined relationships between the roles of individuals who obtain the Reading Certificate and those who earn the Reading and Language Arts Credential. Some distinct differences in role and authorization emerged.

- The holder of the Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential may design and coordinate reading programs and provide staff development at the school, school district, or county level. The holder of the Reading Certificate may coordinate and adapt reading instruction and assist teachers at one or more school sites.
- The holder of the Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential may play a leadership role in materials and program selection at the school, school district, and county level. The holder of the Reading Certificate may play a consultative role in materials and program selection at the district and county level and may take leadership responsibility within the more limited realm of the school site.

**Financial Impact**

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing: None

State Colleges and Universities: None

Private Person: None

Mandated Costs: None

**Notice of Proposed Rulemaking Mailing List and Responses**

**Mailing List**

- Members of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
- California County Superintendents of Schools
- Credential Analysts at the California County Superintendents of Schools Offices
- Superintendents of Selected California School Districts
- Deans and Directors at the California Institutions of Higher Education with Commission-approved programs
- Credential Analysts at the California Institutions of Higher Education with Commission-approved program
- Presidents of Selected Professional Educational Associations

Also placed on the Internet at <http://www.ctc.ca.gov>.

As of October 20, 1999, the Commission had received the following 84 written responses to the public announcement:

<i>In Support</i>	<i>In Opposition</i>
7 organizational opinions	11 organizational opinion
19 personal opinions	47 personal opinion

*Responses received since the June 3, 1999 public hearing are listed in Italics.*

### **Responses Representing Organizations in Support**

1. Diocese of Santa Rosa: Ann P. O'Connor, CSJ, Superintendent of Catholic Schools
2. El Rancho Unified School District: Alfred L. Ogas, Director of Personnel
3. Hot Springs School District: Alan Wilkinson, Superintendent.
4. Laton Unified School District: Tammy L. Alves, Payroll/Personnel Assistant
5. Point Loma Nazarene University: Jo Birdsell, Dean of Education
6. Reading Specialists of California: Carol Sue Adams, President  
*Comment:* Reading Specialists of California is very supportive of these Title 5 Regulations. It is important that all teachers of reading be highly qualified to teach struggling and/or beginning readers. It is also important to allow current teachers to pursue a reading specialist credential under the grandfather clause.
7. Sierra County Office of Education: Marsha Ludwig, SELPA Director

### **Responses Representing Individuals in Support**

1. Hector Alvarez, Administrator/Principal, Jameson School
2. Bruce Barron, Educational Director/Severely Handicapped Teacher, Family Life Center,
3. David Beveridge, Superintendent/Principal, East Nicolaus Joint Unified School District
4. Don Bielke, Chair of Kinesiology Department, California Lutheran University
5. Alice P. Chen, TLP-R Teacher, Moreno Valley Unified School District
6. Eileen M. Davis, BECA Resource Teacher, San Diego Unified School District, District Bilingual Intern Program
7. Douglas L. Decker, Educator, El Segundo Unified School District
8. Karen Ensor, Director of Credential Program, Patten College
9. Jean W. Fennacy, Director of Reading and Language Arts, Fresno Pacific University
10. Marcia Goodwin, Conf. Assistant, Anderson Valley Unified School District
11. Phoebe A. Ivey, Past President, Reading Specialists of California, Perris Elementary School District
12. Michael Kotar, Chair of Education, CSU Chico
13. Jeanie Milliken, Director of Teacher Education, Point Loma Nazarene University
14. Henry W. Page, Principal, Palo Alto Unified School District
15. James E. Richmond, Chair Professional Studies in Education, CSU Chico
16. Gloria Simmons, Principal, Oak Grove Institute - Jack Weaver School
17. Kathy Sloan, Personnel Analyst, Ramona Unified School District
18. Ray Stephens, Director, Challenge Charter School
19. Janet H. Towell, Associate Professor/Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential Coordinator, CSU Stanislaus Teacher Education Department

### **Responses Representing Organizations in Opposition**

1. Association of California School Administrators: Sharon S. Robison, Executive Large/Urban School Districts  
*Comment:* 1) The regulations would prohibit teachers who receive specialized training from teaching reading without a specialist credential; 2) create a greater shortage of qualified reading teachers; 3) undermine district's ability to use teachers who complete the AB 2X Reading Institute.  
*Commission Response:* 1) Specialized training in the form of course work from a college or university for the Reading Certificate or the Reading Specialist Credential program with an approved program assures the quality and consistency of the training. 2) These regulations include a grandparenting clause to allow individuals with three years of experience teaching reading to continue in their positions. Employing agencies may still request a Variable Term Reading Waiver to allow an individual time to complete the requirements for the Reading Certificate. 3) AB 2X contained several different programs for reading. The participants in the Reading Professional Development Institutes, which start in June 1999, include beginning and experienced teachers and the instruction includes phonics, decoding skills, literature, diagnostic, and early intervention techniques. A college or university with an accredited program of professional preparation may consider providing to an enrolled candidate who completes the California Reading Development Institute program "partial and proportional credit" toward satisfaction of the teaching of reading requirement. If the training results in college coursework, it may also be applied toward the units required for the Reading Certificate or Reading Specialist Credential if a college or university submits the course work for program approval. To date, no college or university has requested that the institute course work be included as part of the approved course work for the Reading Certificate or Reading Specialist Credential Program.

2. Borrego Springs Unified School District: Kelli Hoskins, Chief Personnel Officer  
*Comment:* The regulations would create a greater shortage of qualified reading teachers.  
*Commission Response:* The regulations include a grandparenting clause to allow individuals with three years of experience teaching reading to continue in their positions. Employing agencies may still request a Variable Term Reading Waiver to allow an individual time to complete the requirements for the Reading Certificate.
3. Covina Valley Unified School District: Louis A. Pappas, Assistant Superintendent  
*Comment:* 1) This proposal would create a greater shortage of qualified teachers. 2) Conflicts with Governor Davis' reading institute program.  
*Commission Response:* 1) These regulations include a grandparenting clause to allow individuals with three years of experience teaching reading to continue in their positions. Employing agencies may still request a Variable Term Reading Waiver to allow an individual time to complete the requirements for the Reading Certificate. 2) AB 2X contained several different programs for reading. The purpose of the Intensive Reading Program (during intercession, summer school, before or after school, on Saturday, or combination) is to provide students instructional opportunities in reading, to increase their reading skills and enhance reading enjoyment by instructing the students in phonics, decoding skills, literature, diagnostic, and early intervention techniques. To teach reading in a pull-out program or as a separate subject in summer school, after July 1, 2000, the holder of a Multiple Subject Teaching Credential would either need to have three years of reading experience, hold a Reading Certificate or Reading Specialist Credential, or request a Variable Term Waiver in Reading. If the summer school program is designed to include reading as one of the subjects in a self-contained classroom setting, the holder of a Multiple Subject Credential is appropriate to serve in the assignment. If the comments concerns the Reading Professional Development Institutes which starts in June, see the response to question #1 in the response above.
4. Encinitas Union School District: Douglas P. DeVore, Superintendent  
*Comment:* This proposal would prohibit a reading recovery trained teacher from working as a reading teacher to help children. It goes beyond the scope of what is need or required by law.  
*Commission Response:* If the Reading Recovery training resulted in the awarding of units at an accredited college or university, the Commission can review the content of the course work to verify if it meets the 12 semester units required for the Reading Certificate. These regulations include a grandparenting clause to allow individuals with three years of experience teaching reading to continue in their positions.
5. Exeter Public Schools: Diane Graziani, Deputy Superintendent  
*Comment:* We do no (sic) agree with the proposed Title 5 regulations concerning teaching reading as a separate subject for the following reasons: 1) Our district has invested considerable funds and extensive time to the training of our teachers in Reading Recovery. Reading Recovery teachers maintain a regular classroom in which they teach the core subjects and then, for part of their day, work individually with at-risk children using Reading Recovery strategies to bolster their reading abilities. Section 80014.3(a) states that only teachers who have taught on a full time basis as a separate subject may be grandfathered. This regulations will effectively end the reading intervention program developed by our district and supported by local initiative. 2) In the past three years with the onset of class size reduction, districts throughout California were mandated to provide specific professional development in training to our teachers. Teachers gained expertise in the teaching of reading and through the commitment of staff, community, and the governing board programs were developed which would allow local experts to provide ongoing staff development to their colleagues. These staff developers are also practitioners who utilize and refine their teaching strategies through the maintenance of their regular classrooms assignment. Section 80066(d) states that only teachers holding the professional clear Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential are authorized to assist and support the classroom teacher in reading instruction and reading strategies unless grandfathered in. See number 1. This regulation will effectively end the practices of nurturing local talent to provide professional development and utilizing our classrooms for action-based research.  
*Commission Response:* 1) At the June 3<sup>rd</sup> public hearing, Commission staff recommended adding a "full-time" equivalency section to the grandparenting clause. Staff is recommending that Section 80014.3 be withdrawn at the November 4<sup>th</sup> public hearing. 2) The proposed authorization for the Reading and Language Arts Specialist Teaching Credential allows the holder to "plan and conduct staff development". This is an authorization for an individual holding the credential but does not preclude an individual who does not hold a Reading and Language Arts Specialist Teaching



credential from conducting a reading development session. Section 80020.4, approved at the October public hearing, is an authorization for teachers who have been moved from their classroom teaching assignment to serve as a school, district, or county staff developer. It requires a teacher serving as the staff developer in a specific subject to hold a credential in the subject or have his or her expertise in the subject verified and approved by the local governing board.

6. Madera Unified School District: Nancy Akhavan, Educational Specialist

*Comment:* The regulations would create a greater shortage of qualified reading teachers.

*Commission Response:* The regulations include a grandparenting clause to allow individuals with three years of experience teaching reading to continue in their positions. Employing agencies may still request a Variable Term Reading Waiver to allow an individual time to complete the requirements for the Reading Certificate.

7. Manteca Unified School District: Frank W. Purdy, Jr., Assistant Superintendent

*Summary of Comment:* 1) These regulations would prohibit an individual from teaching reading who has been trained in Reading Recovery because they do not qualify for the Specialist Credential. 2) The district has spend large sums of money developing their own reading teacher trainers. These regulations will destroy their program. 3) The district has received grants from the State of California for improving reading instruction in the last two to three years. All the money spent on training district staff developers will be for naught. 4) Most of the district's full-time trainers are experienced and hold a master's degree and are already across the salary schedule. Why would they want to spend more on a credential that could take years to pay off? The district does not pay its staff developers any extra money so there would be no incentive for them to take the training. 5) The district is not happy with the training that teachers are receiving in the teaching of reading at the colleges and universities. There is no guarantee that more is better. If the colleges and universities had their act together, they would adequately train teachers and districts would not have to train their own teachers to become trainers. 6) The regulations will cause a bottleneck in the training of reading teachers and teacher trainers at a time when districts are confronted with large numbers of new and poorly trained teachers. This is not an acceptable solution for middle size and large districts when they are overwhelmed with the problems of recruiting, training, models of teaching and staff development. More training will never compensate for rigorous training in effective models of teaching and staff development.

*Commission Response:* 1) If the Reading Recovery training resulted in the awarding of units at an accredited college or university, the Commission can review the content of the course work to verify if it meets the 12 semester units required for the Reading Certificate. These regulations also include a grandparenting clause to allow individuals with three years of experience teaching reading to continue in their positions. 2) These regulations address the teachers who are teaching K-12 students not the individuals who are staff developers. 3) The intent of the staff development in the 1998 legislation that resulted in AB 1086 and AB 3482 was to bring the classroom teacher up to the standards of the *California Reading Initiative* primarily in the area of phonics. The regulations affect teaching reading in self-contained classrooms. 4) These regulations address the teachers who are teaching students not the individuals who are staff developers. 5) The Commission believes that an individual who will be providing intervention to struggling readers should have specialized training and hold an authorization to perform those services. Either the Reading Certificate or the Reading Specialist will authorize these services. 6) The Commission convened a task force of reading experts to set forth what it is a teacher needs to know to teach struggling readers. The Reading Task Force decided that a minimum standard for someone who could perform intervention strategies is the 12 semester units for the Reading Certificate.

8. Orange County Office of Education: John F. Dean, Superintendent

*Comment:* This letter expresses our concern with proposed Title 5 Section 80014.3 Teaching Reading as a Separate Subject on a Basic Teaching Credential. We understand the Commission's desire to ensure quality instruction in our "pull out" reading classes; however, several vital considerations have not been addressed by the proposed regulations. Our districts see the possibility of losing the services of teachers with extensive training in Reading Recovery, Open Court and other reading programs. The loss of these experienced teachers would have a severe impact on reading programs in many districts. the opportunity to identify talented teachers and provide them with training and support for a specific program adopted by the local district would certainly be lost with these new regulations. A July 1, 2000 time line for implementation of this very large policy change would not allow colleges and universities time to revitalize reading programs to train teachers already in the classroom let alone provide



courses for new reading teachers. The result may be that new classes created by increased funding for K-12 reading programs and our growing student populations will have to be staffed by teachers on waivers. The risk is that we will be forced to assign less not more qualified people to teach our reading classes. We understand your staff is meeting with some representatives from districts, county offices and professional organizations to discuss the proposed regulations. We would hope from this input from the field would be carefully considered and relayed to Commission Members before your staff recommends any further action.

**Commission Response:** If the Reading Recovery or other program training resulted in the awarding of units at an accredited college or university, the Commission can review the content of the course work to verify if it meets the 12 semester units required for the Reading Certificate. These regulations also include a grandparenting clause to allow individuals with three years of experience teaching reading to continue in their positions.

At the June 3<sup>rd</sup> public hearing, Commission staff recommended extending the date of the grandparenting clause. Staff is recommending that Section 80014.3 be withdrawn at the November 4<sup>th</sup> public hearing.

9. *Poway Unified School District: Diane M. Cantelli, Area Superintendent*

**Comment:** After July 1, 2000, individual who do not meet the requirements in (a) must hold a separate authorization to teach elementary level reading instruction for 50% or more time as a separate subject to students other than those in their self-contained classroom.

**Commission Response:** At the June 3<sup>rd</sup> public hearing, Commission staff recommended adding a "full-time" equivalency section to the grandparenting clause. Staff is recommending that Section 80014.3 be withdrawn at the November 4<sup>th</sup> public hearing.

10. *Simi Valley Unified School District: Cary Dritz, Ed.D., Assistant Superintendent, Personnel Services*

**Comment:** We at the Simi Valley Unified School District are opposed to the proposed addition of Section 80014.3 and the Amendment to Section 80066 for the following reasons: 1) All new elementary teachers are already required to pass the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment test. The requirement of an additional credential to teach reading is redundant given the new requirements under RICA. 2) The majority of our teachers have a strong background in language arts. 3) Staff development in language arts is a major priority in our District. 4) This would restrict the pool from which to hire reading intervention teachers creating another shortage area. Please take these objections into consideration at the June 3, 1999 public hearing.

**Commission Response:** 1) Not all new elementary teachers are required to pass RICA. The RICA requirement applies to candidates who complete any of the requirements for his or her initial Multiple Subject Teaching Credential on or after October 1, 1998. Applicants who hold a valid elementary teaching credential from another state are exempt. In addition, the RICA examination is designed to ensure that candidates for the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential possess the knowledge and skills important for the beginning reading teacher in basic reading instruction. The RICA examination does not train teachers to provide assistance to students who are struggling with basic reading skills and strategies. 2) A strong background in language arts does not ensure that the teacher has the necessary knowledge and skills to teach reading as a separate subject to students who are struggling with basic reading skills and strategies. 3) The Commission has no authority over the content or quality of staff development. 4) The regulations include a grandparenting clause to allow individuals with three years of experience teaching reading to continue in their positions. Employing agencies may still request a Variable Term Reading Waiver to allow an individual time to complete the requirements for the Reading Certificate.

11. *Stanislaus Union School District: Chet Jensen, Assistant Superintendent*

**Comment:** Title 5, Section 80014.3(a) will remove the authority to teach reading as a separate subject for existing credential holders (unless they taught reading full-time as a separate subject for three years prior to July 1, 2000). The Commission has traditionally maintained the authorizations of prior credentials when changes are made to existing credentials. Title 5, Section 80014.3(b) will prohibit credential holders from teaching reading in a "Joplinized" setting (where pupils move out of their self-contained classroom to receive reading instruction). This is an effective, research-proven method of providing reading instruction. I respectfully recommend that Title 5, Section 80014.3(a) and (b) be revised to read:

(a) Notwithstanding any other section of regulation, nothing shall prohibit an individual who has taught reading full time as a separate subject for a minimum of three years prior to July 1, 2000 on the basis of their his/her non-emergency Multiple Subject, General Elementary, Standard Elementary, or Single Subject in English Teaching

Credential from continuing serving in such assignment. Verification of this teaching experience must be kept on file in the office of the employing agency for purposes of the monitoring of certificated assignments pursuant to Education Code Section 44258.9(b).

(b) After July 1, 2000, individuals who do not meet the requirements in (a) must hold a separate authorization to teach elementary level reading full-time instruction as a separate subject to students, other than those in their self-contained classroom.

**Commission Response:** 1) The Multiple Subject Teaching Credential authorizes an individual to teach in a self-contained classroom and in a regrouping, team teaching, or core setting. Absent the Reading Certificate, the Commission allowed an individual holding an elementary credential to teach reading as a separate subject. With the availability of the Reading Certificate, it is timely for the Commission to review and update the regulations concerning who can teach reading as a specific subject to struggling students. The suggested revision of Section 80014.3(a) would allow an individual who has taught on a part-time basis to qualify for the grandparenting clause. The Commission believes that an individual who has taught reading on a part-time basis does not have enough experience to serve in this capacity. 2) An individual holding an elementary credential may, according to Education Code §44258.15, regroup students across learning levels. This allows students being served in a self-contained classroom to be regrouped across reading learning levels. The proposed changes to Section 80014.3(b) will not change this. The suggested revision of Section 80014.3(b) would allow an individual to teach reading as a specific subject on a part-time basis and only require the individual who is teaching reading full-time to hold the additional authorization. The Commission feels that regardless of whether the assignment is for a full or part-time reading instructor that the individual should hold the additional Reading Certificate authorization.

### ***Responses Representing Individuals in Opposition***

Comments by individuals in opposition that expressed common concerns have been grouped below for clarity of response. There is a summary of the common concerns followed by a list of the individuals that expressed each given concern.

1. **Comment:** There are not enough certificated reading specialists to staff a summer school. These regulations should not apply to newly enacted legislation regarding retention/summer school.

**Commission Response:** See response #1 under Organizations in Opposition

Jenifer S. Ahlstrand, Principal, Farmersville Unified School District

Maryann Boylan, Principal, Farmersville Unified School District

Janet Jones, Superintendent, Farmersville Unified School District

2. **Comment:** Teachers should not be required to complete additional training or obtain a separate authorization to teach reading.

**Commission Response:** The Commission has determined the minimum standards for teaching reading as a separate subject based on recommendation of the expert task force. The Reading Certificate, a 12 semester unit program of course work, authorizes teaching specialized reading instruction at the school site level to struggling students. The Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential authorizes serving at the district or county level. The Specialist Credential may also be used at the school site level but it is not required. The holder of a Multiple Subject Credential may teach reading as part of the self-contained classroom.

Craig Boyan, (no agency or title given)

Michael J. Dutra, Education Director, Children's Home of Stockton

William H. Krapfel, Miller-Unruh Instructor, Pleasant Valley School District

Diane Lynne Lemus, Teacher, Exeter Schools

3. **Comment:** Teachers who have specialized training or staff development would not be able to work as a reading teacher without obtaining a specialized credential.

**Commission Response:** If the training resulted in the awarding of units at an accredited college or university, the Commission can review the content of the course work to verify if it meets all or part of the 12 semester units required for the Reading Certificate. The regulations include a grandparenting clause to allow individuals with three years of experience teaching reading to continue in their positions. Employing agencies may still request a Variable Term Reading Waiver to allow an individual time to complete the requirements for the Reading Certificate.

Nancy Cunningham, Director of Administrative Services, Encinitas Union School District

Willy Ginaven, Librarian, Encinitas Union School District

Cassie Hulsey, Second Grade Teacher, Lincoln Elementary School  
M. A. Inderbitzen, Assistant Principal, ACSA-Merced City School District  
Shannon Kuder, School Board Vice-President, Encinitas Union School District  
Kathy Reese, parent, (no agency given)

4. *Comment:* The regulations would create a greater shortage of qualified reading teachers.

*Commission Response:* The regulations include a grandparenting clause to allow individuals with three years of experience teaching reading to continue in their positions. Employing agencies may still request a Variable Term Reading Waiver to allow an individual time to complete the requirements for the Reading Certificate.

Jessica Bradshaw, Director of Projects, Exeter Public Schools  
Beth Hergesheimer, VP of Legislation, PTA-Flora Vista Elementary School, Encinitas Union School District  
M. A. Inderbitzen, Assistant Principal, ACSA-Merced City School District (also see #3)  
Mark Richmond, Principal, Farmersville Unified School District

5. *Comment:* These regulations would prohibit an individual from teaching reading who has been trained in Reading Recovery.

*Commission Response:* If the Reading Recovery training resulted in the awarding of units at an accredited college or university, the Commission can review the content of the course work to verify if it meets all or part of the 12 semester units required for the Reading Certificate. These regulations also include a grandparenting clause to allow individuals with three years of experience teaching reading to continue in their positions.

Ellen B. Amaro, VP-Legislation , (no agency given)  
Jennifer Marie Brooks, Kindergarten Teacher/Chapter I, Exeter School District  
Jessica Bradshaw, Director of Projects, Exeter Public Schools (also see # 4)  
Karen de Goede, Teacher, Exeter Public Schools  
Jennifer Garcia, First Grade Teacher, Exeter Schools  
Margaret Harke, Second Grade Teacher, Exeter Public Schools  
Arlene Kelemen, Teacher, Exeter Union School District  
Shivon Lavelly, First Grade Teacher, Exeter Public Schools  
Kathy McDaniel, First Grade Teacher, Exeter Public Schools  
David Alan Newmann, Program Supervisor, Berkeley Unified School District  
Diane Nickell, Kindergarten Teacher, Exeter Elementary School  
Annie Picking-Speck, Teacher, Exeter School District  
Renee Y. Pratt, Kindergarten Teacher/Reading Recovery, Exeter Public Schools  
Teresa Reyes-Gle, Teacher, Exeter Public Schools  
Nancy Scott, Second Grade Teacher, Exeter Public Schools  
Mary E. R. Smith, Kindergarten Teacher, Exeter Public Schools  
Miriam Smith, Principal, Exeter Public Schools  
Judy Stansbury, Second Grade Teacher, Lincoln School  
Leslie Stevens, Classroom Reading Recovery Teacher, Exeter Elementary School  
Lana F. Weatherly, Reading Recovery/Chapter I Teacher, Exeter Public Schools  
Nancy Q. Winningham, Teacher, Exeter Public Schools  
Sherry Woods, First Grade Teacher, Exeter Public Schools  
Dorcas Jean Yates, First Grade Teacher, Exeter Public Schools

6. *Patty A. Bietz, Teacher, Exeter Public Schools*

*Comment:* The proposed Title 5 regulations would severely affect the services provided to our lower students. These students require much one-on-one time, attention, and diversity of approach. this regulation would only take away valuable proven resources.

*Commission Response:* The Commission convened a task force of reading experts to set forth what it is a teacher needs to know to teach struggling readers. The Reading Task Force decided that a minimum standard for someone who could perform intervention strategies is the 12 semester units for the Reading Certificate.

7. *Barbara Fajardo, Literacy Specialist, Alisal Union School District*

*Comment:* Teachers who have been very successful with struggling readers may not be able to continue. This is no incentive to get such a credential.

*Commission Response:* The Commission convened a task force of reading experts to set forth what it is a teacher needs to know to teach struggling readers. The Reading Task Force decided that a minimum standard for someone who could perform intervention strategies is the 12 semester units for the Reading Certificate.

8. *Daniel Grider, Assistant Superintendent, Encinitas Union School District*

*Comment:* This addition to Title 5 Regulations will expand scope of requirements beyond the law.

*Commission Response:* Education Code Section 44225(e) requires the Commission to "determine the scope and authorization of credentials, to ensure competence in

teaching and other educational services, and establish sanctions for the misuse of credentials and the misassignment of credential holders."

9. Robert W. Kuehl, Associate - Principal, Beaumont Unified School District  
*Comment:* In a time of teacher shortages, you are proposing regulations which further restrict who can teach what. Congratulations on your foresight (sic). Is this more of the Education Professors Tenure Act (as Tier Two has been)?  
*Commission Response:* The Commission believes that an individual who will be providing intervention to struggling readers should have specialized training and hold an authorization to perform those services. Either the Reading Certificate or the Reading Specialist Credential will authorize these services. These regulations do not relate to tenure or Tier II for the Administrative Services Credential.
10. Judith A Pegg, Special Program Aide, Exeter Public Schools  
*Comment:* None
11. Mavis I. Price, Resource Specialist/Reading Recovery, Exeter Public Schools  
*Comment:* None
12. Peter Ruggles, Principal, Target Schools  
*Comment:* Yet another example of a credential which has no purpose other than to reduce administrative flexibility and to increase the number of \_\_\_\_\_ specialists.  
*Commission Response:* The Commission believes that an individual who will be providing intervention to struggling readers should have the training and hold an authorization to perform those services. Either the Reading Certificate or the Reading Specialist Credential will authorize these services.
13. Doris Z. Salter, Reading Specialist. Arvin Union School District  
*Comment:* I agree w/ACSA's opposition for the same reasons.  
*Commission Response:* See response to under # 1 in Organizations in Opposition.
14. Pam Williams, Reading Specialist, El Segundo Unified School District  
*Comment:* I don't understand the part the RICA exam plays in determining a candidate's eligibility for a Reading Specialist Credential. Will you address this issue at your hearing?  
*Commission Response:* Until June 30, 2000, an individual may use the passing score on the Performance Assessment Component of the RICA examination at the Reading Certificate level to meet six semester units of course work for the Reading Certificate. The Reading Certificate portion of the program standards was designed to comprise the first half of a full Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential Program. This "nesting" of standards allows individuals to apply course work obtained in pursuit of a Certificate toward completion of the Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential.

## Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Commission adopt the proposed amendment to Section 80066 concerning the Reading and Language Arts Specialist Teaching Credential and withdraw from consideration the addition of Section 80014.3 concerning the Teaching of Reading as a Separate Subject on a Basic Teaching Credential.

---

Letterhead



(916) 445-0184

OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

99-9910

DATE: April 16, 1999

TO: All Individuals and Groups Interested in the Activities of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

FROM: Sam W. Swofford, Ed.D.  
Executive Director

SUBJECT: Proposed Addition of Section 80014.3 and Amendment to Section 80066 of Title

## **Notice of Public Hearing is Hereby Given**

In accordance with Commission policy, the following Title 5 Regulation is being distributed prior to the public hearing. A copy of the proposed regulations is attached:

Proposed Addition of Section 80014.3 and Amendment to Section 80066

The public hearing is scheduled for:

**June 3, 1999**

**1:30 p.m.**

**California Commission on Teacher Credentialing  
1900 Capitol Avenue  
Sacramento, California**

## **Statement of Reasons**

### *Purpose /Effect of Proposed Action*

The proposed additions of Title 5 §80014.3 clarifies which individuals are authorized to teach reading as a separate subject on the basis of their basic teaching credential including a grandparenting clause for those individuals who have been teaching reading on a basic teaching credential.

The proposed amendments to Title 5 §80066 clarify the requirements, the valid period, and the authorization for the professional clear Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential which are not currently in regulation.

## **Documents Relied Upon in Preparing Regulations**

Standard for the Preparation of Multiple Subject Teaching Credential Candidates for Reading, Writing and Related Language Instruction in English.

## **Documents Incorporated by Reference**

No documents were incorporated by reference.

## **Written Comment Period**

Any interested person, or his or her authorized representative, may submit written comments on the proposed actions. The written comment period closes at 5:00 p.m. on June 2, 1999. Comments must be received by that time at the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, attn. Executive Office, 1900 Capitol Avenue, Sacramento, California 95814-4213.

Any written comments received 14 days prior to the public hearing will be reproduced by the Commission's staff for each Commissioner as a courtesy to the person submitting the comments and will be included in the written agenda prepared for and presented to the full Commission at the hearing.

## **Public Hearing**

Oral comments on the proposed action will also be taken at the public hearing. We would appreciate 14 days advance notice in order to schedule sufficient time on the agenda for all speakers. Please contact the Certification Division Director's Office at (916) 445-0234 regarding this.

Any person wishing to submit written comments at the public hearing may do so. It is requested, but not required, that persons submitting such comments provide fifty copies to be distributed to the Commissioners and interested members of the public. All written statements submitted at the hearing will, however, be given full consideration regardless of the number of copies submitted.

## **Modification of Proposed Action**

If the Commission proposes to modify the actions hereby proposed, the modifications (other than nonsubstantial or solely grammatical modifications) will be made available for public



comment for at least 15 days before they are adopted.

### **Contact Person/Further Information**

Inquiries concerning the proposed action may be directed to Terri H. Fesperman by telephone at (916) 323-5777 or by electronic mail at [[tfesperman@ctc.ca.gov](mailto:tfesperman@ctc.ca.gov)]. Upon request, a copy of the express terms of the proposed action and a copy of the initial statement of reasons will be made available. In addition, all the information upon which this proposal is based is available for inspection and copying.

---

## **California Commission on Teacher Credentialing**

### **Division VIII of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations**

#### **Proposed Addition of Section 80014.3 and Amendment to Section 80066 Concerning Teaching Reading as a Separate Subject on a Basic Teaching Credential and the Reading and Language Arts Specialist Teaching Credential**

##### **Title 5 Section 80014.3. Teaching Reading as a Separate Subject on a Basic Teaching Credential.**

- (a) Notwithstanding any other section of regulation, nothing shall prohibit an individual who has taught reading full-time as a separate subject for three years prior to July 1, 2000 on the basis of their non-emergency Multiple Subject, General Elementary, Standard Elementary, or Single Subject in English Teaching Credential from continuing in such assignment. Verification of this teaching experience must be kept on file in the office of the employing agency for purposes of the monitoring of certificated assignments pursuant to Education Code Section 44258.9(b).
- (b) After July 1, 2000, individuals who do not meet the requirements in (a) must hold a separate authorization to teach elementary level reading instruction as a separate subject to students other than those in their self-contained classroom.

---

Note: Authority cited: Section 44225(q), Education Code. Reference: Sections 44225(b) 44225(e), and 44258.9(b). Education Code.

##### **Title 5 Section 80066. Specific Requirements for the Professional Clear Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential.**

- (a) The minimum requirements for the professional clear Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential for applicants who complete a professional preparation program in California shall include (1) through (3):
  - (1) possession of a valid basic California teaching credential as defined in Education Code Section 44203(e);
  - (2) completion of a post baccalaureate professional preparation program accredited by the Committee on Accreditation for the Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential, including successful completion of supervised student teaching; and
  - (3) the recommendation from a regionally accredited institution of higher education that has a Reading and Language Arts Specialist program accredited by the Committee on Accreditation.
- (b) The minimum requirements for the professional clear Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential for applicants who complete a professional preparation program outside California shall include (1) and (2). Applicants may apply directly to the Commission for the professional clear Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential under this section:
  - (1) possession of a valid basic California teaching credential as defined in Education Code Section 44203(e); and
  - (2) completion of a post baccalaureate professional preparation program comparable to a program accredited by the Committee on Accreditation for the Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential, including successful completion of supervised student teaching, but taken outside California. The program must be from a regionally

accredited institution of higher education and approved by the appropriate state agency where the course work was completed.

- (c) The professional clear Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential issued on the basis of the completion of all requirements shall be dated per Title 5 Section 80553.
- (d) The Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential authorizes the holder to assist and support the classroom teacher in reading instruction and teaching strategies, select and adapt reading instruction materials, plan and conduct reading staff development, assess student progress and monitor student achievement in reading, provide direct reading intervention work with students, and develop and coordinate reading programs at the school site, school district, or county level in grades twelve and below, including preschool, and in classes organized primarily for adults.

Note: Authority cited: Section 44225(q), Education Code. Reference: Sections 44203(e), 44225(d), 44225(e), and 44265, Education Code.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

GRAY DAVIS, Governor

**CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING**

1900 Capitol Avenue  
Sacramento, California 95814-4213  
(916) 445-0184



**OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR**

Attn: Sam W. Swofford, Ed.D., Executive Director

**Title: Teaching Reading as a Separate Subject  
on a Basic Teaching Credential and the  
Reading and Language Arts Specialist  
Teaching Credential**

Section No.: Proposed Addition of Section  
80014.3 and Amendment to Section 80066

**Response to the Attached Title 5 Regulations**

So that the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing can more clearly estimate the general field response to the attached Title 5 Regulations, please return this response form to the Commission office, attention Executive Office, at the above address by 5:00 pm on June 2, 1999 in order that the material can be presented at the June 3, 1999 public hearing.

- 1. ☐ **Yes**, I agree with the proposed Title 5 regulations. Please count me in favor of these regulations.
- 2. ☐ **No**, I do not agree with the proposed Title 5 Regulations for the following reasons:  
(If additional space is needed, use the reverse of this sheet.)

- 3. ☐ Personal opinion of the undersigned and/or
- 4. ☐ Organizational opinion representing: (Circle One)  
School District, County Schools, College, University, Professional Organization, Other
- 5. ☐ I shall be at the public hearing, place my name on the list for making a presentation to the Commission.
- 6. ☐ No, I will not make a presentation to the Commission at the public hearing.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Printed Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_ Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

Employer/Organization: \_\_\_\_\_

Letterhead



OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR  
(916) 445-0184

99-9921

DATE: October 8, 1999

TO: Individuals and Groups Interested in the Issue of Teaching Reading

FROM: Sam W. Swofford, Ed.D.  
Executive Director

SUBJECT: Subject: Proposed Addition of Section 80014.3 and Amendment to Section 80066 of Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Concerning Teaching Reading as a Separate Subject on a Basic Teaching Credential and the Reading and Language Arts Specialist Teaching Credential

### **Notice of Resumption of Public Hearing is Hereby Given**

The public hearing on the addition of Section 80014.3 and amendment to Section 80066 opened on June 3, 1999. The Commission voted at the June public hearing to continue the public hearing for a minimum of 90 days. The resumption of the public hearing is scheduled for:

**November 4, 1999  
1:30 p.m.  
California Commission on Teacher Credentialing  
1900 Capitol Avenue  
Sacramento, California**

When the public hearing is resumed on November 4, 1999, staff plans to recommend to the Commission to withdraw Section 80014.3. A copy of the proposed regulations is attached.

### **Statement of Reasons**

#### *Purpose /Effect of Proposed Action*

The proposed additions of Title 5 §80014.3 clarifies which individuals are authorized to teach reading as a separate subject on the basis of their basic teaching credential including a grandparenting clause for those individuals who have been teaching reading on a basic teaching credential.

The proposed amendments to Title 5 §80066 clarify the requirements, the valid period, and the authorization for the professional clear Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential which are not currently in regulation.

### **Public Hearing**

Oral comments on the proposed action will also be taken at the public hearing. We would appreciate 14 days advance notice in order to schedule sufficient time on the agenda for all speakers. Please contact the Certification Division Director's Office at (916) 445-0234 regarding this.

Any person wishing to submit written comments at the public hearing may do so. It is



requested, but not required, that persons submitting such comments provide fifty copies to be distributed to the Commissioners and interested members of the public. All written statements submitted at the hearing will, however, be given full consideration regardless of the number of copies submitted

### **Contact Person/Further Information**

Inquiries concerning the proposed action may be directed to Terri H. Fesperman by telephone at (916) 323-5777 or by electronic mail at [[tfesperman@ctc.ca.gov](mailto:tfesperman@ctc.ca.gov)]. Upon request, a copy of the express terms of the proposed action and a copy of the initial statement of reasons will be made available. In addition, all the information upon which this proposal is based is available for inspection and copying.

---

## **California Commission on Teacher Credentialing**

### **Division VIII of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations**

#### **Proposed Addition of Section 80014.3 and Amendment to Section 80066 Concerning Teaching Reading as a Separate Subject on a Basic Teaching Credential and the Reading and Language Arts Specialist Teaching Credential**

##### **Title 5 Section 80014.3. Teaching Reading as a Separate Subject on a Basic Teaching Credential.**

- (a) Notwithstanding any other section of regulation, nothing shall prohibit an individual who has taught reading full-time as a separate subject for three years prior to July 1, 2000 on the basis of their non-emergency Multiple Subject, General Elementary, Standard Elementary, or Single Subject in English Teaching Credential from continuing in such assignment. Verification of this teaching experience must be kept on file in the office of the employing agency for purposes of the monitoring of certificated assignments pursuant to Education Code Section 44258.9(b).
- (b) After July 1, 2000, individuals who do not meet the requirements in (a) must hold a separate authorization to teach elementary level reading instruction as a separate subject to students other than those in their self-contained classroom.

---

Note: Authority cited: Section 44225(q), Education Code. Reference: Sections 44225(b) 44225(e), and 44258.9(b). Education Code.

##### **Title 5 Section 80066. Specific Requirements for the Professional Clear Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential.**

- (a) The minimum requirements for the professional clear Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential for applicants who complete a professional preparation program in California shall include (1) through (3):
  - (1) possession of a valid basic California teaching credential as defined in Education Code Section 44203(e);
  - (2) completion of a post baccalaureate professional preparation program accredited by the Committee on Accreditation for the Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential, including successful completion of supervised student teaching; and
  - (3) the recommendation from a regionally accredited institution of higher education that has a Reading and Language Arts Specialist program accredited by the Committee on Accreditation.
- (b) The minimum requirements for the professional clear Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential for applicants who complete a professional preparation program outside California shall include (1) and (2). Applicants may apply directly to the Commission for the professional clear Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential under this section:
  - (1) possession of a valid basic California teaching credential as defined in Education Code Section 44203(e); and

- (2) completion of a post baccalaureate professional preparation program comparable to a program accredited by the Committee on Accreditation for the Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential, including successful completion of supervised student teaching, but taken outside California. The program must be from a regionally accredited institution of higher education and approved by the appropriate state agency where the course work was completed.
- (c) The professional clear Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential issued on the basis of the completion of all requirements shall be dated per Title 5 Section 80553.
- (d) The Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential authorizes the holder to assist and support the classroom teacher in reading instruction and teaching strategies, select and adapt reading instruction materials, plan and conduct reading staff development, assess student progress and monitor student achievement in reading, provide direct reading intervention work with students, and develop and coordinate reading programs at the school site, school district, or county level in grades twelve and below, including preschool, and in classes organized primarily for adults.

---

Note: Authority cited: Section 44225(q), Education Code. Reference: Sections 44203(e), 44225(d), 44225(e), and 44265, Education Code.